THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

TRADITION AND DISSENT IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY PROPHETS AND JEREMIAH

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

GILBERT GERALD HARROP

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE, 1950

PREFACE

The neo-traditionalists of our day have sought to make the prophets of Israel their own. Many of them have gone back to the earlier Jewish and Christian viewpoint which would make these men preachers and commentators rather than dissenters and innovators. They have thus claimed the Old Testament prophets for themselves. This study is an exegetical investigation of that claim--a claim which can be decided only on the basis of the words of the prophets as far as we can recover them.

The second edition of Kittel's Biblia Hebraica and The Bible: An American Translation have been used throughout. Quotations from the Bible in English are from the latter translation unless otherwise indicated.

The writer is indebted to his Old Testament teachers, particularly W. A. Irwin who has been teacher, guide and friend during days of post-graduate study. Despite the many miles that have separated us throughout the execution of this project he has never failed to provide encouragement, help and advice at all stages of the work.

G. Gerald Harrop
Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada
April 15, 1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT OF AIMS AND METHODS . . . 1

II. THE SHAPE OF THE RELIGIOUS TRADITION IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY 13

The Prophets' Knowledge of the Early Tradition
Summary of Eighth Century Prophets
Archaeology and the Tradition of Early Israel
The Shape of the Tradition in Eighth Century Israel

III. THE EIGHTH CENTURY PROPHETS 36

Preliminary Remarks
Amos
Hosea
Micah
Isaiah
The Eighth Century Prophet as Traditionalist
The Eighth Century Prophet as Dissenter
Concluding Generalizations on Eighth Century Prophecy

IV. DEUTERONOMY 81

The Problem of Deuteronomy
Deuteronomy as a "Hard" Tradition
The Covenant in Deuteronomy

V. JEREMIAH 96

Jeremiah's Witness to the Tradition
Jeremiah's Witness to His Prophetic Predecessors
Jeremiah's Appeal to the Tradition
Jeremiah's Alleged Acceptance of Deteronomy
The Mood of Dissent in Jeremiah
Jeremiah as An Individualist

Chapter Page

VI. CONCLUSIONS 109

Common Traditional Elements
Traditional Elements Not Common
Common Dissenting Attitudes
Dissenting Attitudes Not Common
Two Traditions within the Prophecy under Review?
The Role of Tradition and Dissent in Creative Religious Thinking
The Modern Religious Leader and These Prophets

APPENDIXES 121

A. MOWINCKEL'S "PROPHECY AND TRADITION" 122

B. AN EXAMINATION OF DR. H. H. ROWLEY'S ARGUMENTS FOR THE PROPHETIC ACCEPTANCE OF SACRIFICE 127

C. THE SUMMARY ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS 136

BIBLIOGRAPHY 168

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT OF AIMS AND METHODS

In a few words John Calvin disposed of our problem:

> It is customary to make a great number of statements and dissertations about the office of the prophets. But, in my opinion, the shortest way of treating this subject is to trace the Prophets to the Law, from which they derived their doctrines, like streams from a fountain; for they placed it before them as their rule, so that they may be justly held and declared to be its interpreters, who utter nothing but what is connected with the Law . . . the Prophets are appendages to the Law, and are all briefly summed up in the Law. . . .[1]

For Calvin, then, the early writing prophets were anything but religious innovators or dissenters. They were preachers of the Law and commentators upon its precepts. This is also the position of traditional Jewish[2] and traditional Roman Catholic[3] interpretation. Underlying this attitude is the assumption that the order in which we find the books of the Bible is, at least

---

[1]L. Calvin, Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, trans. Wm. Pringle (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1850), I, xxvi, xxviii.

[2]M. Wiener, "Prophets and Prophecy," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, VIII, 659. "For tradition does not recognize any evolution, not at least in a vital issue of religion. The full content and might of the prophetic spirit are supposed to have been in force from the first, so that what happened subsequently could be at best the resplendence of the original light."

[3]J. Coles, "Prophecy, Prophet and Prophetess," The Catholic Encyclopedia, XII, 477. He [i.e., the prophet] had to maintain and develop the knowledge and practice of the Old Law among the chosen people, lead them back when they strayed.

approximately, the correct chronological order. "Law" precedes "Prophecy" in the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and vernacular Bibles; thus it is natural to assume that the prophets had access to the Law and were its interpreters. On this view the prophets are traditionalists appealing to their contemporaries in the name of Moses, not on their own authority.

This position is sometimes held, in some degree at least by modern critical scholars who do not accept, at least in its rigid entirety, the simple notion that the books of the Bible are in every case simple documents by single writers arranged in approximate chronological order. W. F. Albright seems to come very close to Calvin's position: "The tradition of Israel represents the Prophets as preachers and reformers, not as religious innovators; rigid historical and philological exegesis of our sources agrees with tradition."[1]

For A. B. Davidson "prophecy stood on the foundation of the law"[2] and the prophets "did not create that ideal of the Israel of God which they seek to see realized; they received it from the past."[3] Skinner sees in the prophets a constant "appeal to a traditional Tora, or revelation of Yahweh, common to all Israelites, in which the character of Yahweh and the conditions of intercourse with Him are authoritatively declared."[4]

---

[1]W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1940), p. 309.

[2]A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1904), p. 5.

[3]Ibid., pp. 18, 19.

[4]J. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion (Cambridge: The University Press, 1926), p. 5, cf. p. 332.

C. H. Dodd declares that the theology, soteriology and eschatology of Amos were "inherited from the past and shared by most of his countrymen."[1] Even W. C. Graham and H. G. May conclude that the prophets were, at least in some cases, conscious that they were appealing to "an ancient and obsolescent revelation."[2]

Thus it is at once evident that one can differ from Calvin's critical presuppositions and yet retain his conviction that, to some extent at least, the prophets did appeal to tradition and derived from it many of their ideals and underlying convictions. It is not begging our question to decide at once that this must have been the case. No religious leader starts de novo; in fact no leader, however revolutionary, seeks to buttress his case with a claim to novelty. The usual method is to appeal against the traditions as contemporaries understand them in the name of the original tradition, before accretions, as the leader himself understands that. Hence we have what is so common in Christianity, movements which claim to get back to the original tradition as originally understood. Modern critical scholars do not usually make the claim of novelty for the prophets, except on the pages of their adversaries' books.[3]

---

[1]C. H. Dodd, The Bible Today (Cambridge: The University Press, 1947), p. 39.

[2]W. C. Graham and H. G. May, Culture and Conscience (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 219.

[3]See, however, R. Calkins, The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets (New York: Harper Bros., 1947), p. 22. "Now every one of these ideas [e.g., righteousness as a universal principle, repudiation of the idea of divine protection for Israel even in sin, etc.] was absolutely new in the day of Amos. Also W.O.E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowl-

It is correct to say, however, that the rise of modern historical scholarship in the Biblical field drastically modified the conception of Old Testament students as to the role of the prophets in relationship to tradition and that Calvin's statement that the prophets "derive their doctrines" from the law "like streams from a fountain" came to be regarded as almost the precise opposite of the actual case. Thus G. H. Gilbert, writing in 1908 a history of Biblical interpretation from the standpoint of modern criticism, had this to say:

> Thus the true chronological order is not Law and Prophets but Prophets and Law and historical criticism points to the writings of Hosea and Amos as the earliest parts of the Old Testament. This reversal of ancient judgments . . . gives light and consistency to the picture of the religious development of Israel.[1]

"This reversal of ancient judgments" has often been attributed to the work of Julius Wellhausen who in his Prolegomena to the History of Israel developed and popularized the ideas of his predecessor Graf. Wellhausen's position, as set forth in the Prolegomena is by no means as uncomplicated as Gilbert's summation. In commenting upon Micah vi: 6-8 Wellhausen says: "It is no new matter, but a thing well known that sacrifices are not what the Torah of the Lord contains."[2] It is thus conceded that the prophets are preceded by something that can be described as

---

edge, 1930), p. 223. "The result of their thinking and of their strong convictions was that the prophets of Israel offered men an new doctrine. . . ."

[1]G. H. Gilbert, Interpretation of the Bible (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908), p. 274.

[2]J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies (Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1885), p. 58.

Torah. Wellhausen sets forth his position on the source of prophetic authority most clearly in the following words:

> They do not preach on set texts; they speak out of the spirit which judges all things and itself is judged by no man. Where do they lean on any other authority than the truth of what they say? Where do they rest on any other foundation than their own certainty? It belongs to the notion of prophecy, of true revelation, that Jehovah, overlooking all the media of ordinances and institutions, communicates himself to the individual, the called one, in whom that mysterious and irreducible rapport in which the deity stands with man clothes itself with energy. Apart from the prophet, in abstracto there is no revelation; it lives in his divine-human ego. This gives rise to a synthesis of apparent contradictions: the subjective in the highest sense, exalted above all ordinances, is the truly objective, the divine. This it proves itself to be by the consent of the consciences of all, on which the prophets count, just as Jesus does in the gospel of John, in spite of all their polemic against the traditional religion. They are not saying anything new: they are only proclaiming old truth. While acting in the most creative way they feel entirely passive: the homo tantum et audacia which may with perfect justice be applied to such men as Elijah, Amos and Isaiah, is with them equivalent to the deus tantum et servitus. But their creed is not to be found in any book. It is barbarism in dealing with any such a phenomenon to distort its physiognomy by introducing the law.[1]

Thus, for Wellhausen, the prophets are "proclaiming old truth"; this old truth, however, does not seem to be discoverable in literature, certainly not in the Law. Wellhausen and his followers do not represent the prophets as creating their doctrines ex nihilo but they certainly do differ from the traditional viewpoint so clearly set forth in Calvin. The criticism which this school offered to this traditional viewpoint has given rise to some very interesting and important questions which it will be the purpose of this dissertation to explore.

Is there a body of belief and thought, expressing itself in the literature we have, which reveals for us something of the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 398.

tradition in which the prophets stood, and which contains statements of ideas which they took for granted and built upon? To what extent were the prophets dissenters from this tradition, or religious innovators? What have the prophets to teach modern religious leaders concerning a creative, constructive and effective attitude to the traditions in which they stand?

Our first task is to try to define and describe what we mean by "tradition." This word does not appear in the English of the King James Version of the Old Testament. It does, however, appear several times in the New Testament, and when found there it is a translation of paradosis which comes from the verb paradidomi meaning "to give" or "to hand over." We do find paradosis in the LXX translation of II Esdras vii:26 for נתן) and in Jeremiah xxxix(xxxii):4 and xli(xxxiv):2 (for the niphal of מסר), but in none of these cases is it ideas of any kind that are "handed over."

Matthew 15:2,36 and Mark 7:3 ff. show us that by New Testament times the expression "tradition of the elders" or "your [i.e. the Jews] tradition" was an established expression. Paul, in Galatians 1:14 writes of "the tradition of my fathers." I Corinthians 11:2, II Thessalonians 2:15, 3:6 indicate that this word was soon taken over by the Church and used even in these very early Christian documents. Colossians 2:8 contrasts "human traditions" (tēn paradosin tōn anthrōpōn) with that which is "according to Christ" (kata Kriston). In all these New Testament passages the expression "tradition(s)" represents a group of ideas, apparently recognizable at once by Jews or Christians, which have been "handed over" and are to be kept.

In I Timothy 6:20 we have the expression tēn parathēkēn meaning "what has been intrusted to you" or "the deposit."[1] The reference is almost certainly to hē paradosis. Combining these two words in their New Testament contexts we come to a definition of tradition as a constellation of ideas, doctrines, moral or religious precepts "handed over" within the religious community to be kept in trust or guarded by the recipients. In his article entitled "Tradition" in the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, N. P. Williams presents a very similar definition, adding to it the notion of "depositaries"--or persons commissioned to guard the deposit.[2] With the emergence of the deposit and the depositaries there comes within the group the "impulse to conform."[3] It is quite common among Old Testament students to regard the priests as the depositaries and the great prophets as their op-

---

[1]This word is used in the LXX translation of Lev. 6:2,4 (5:21,23) for פִּקָּדוֹן . In The Bible, An American Translation it is rendered "deposit" and "what was deposited with him." In neither case has it anything to do with religious ideas, as it certainly has in I Timothy.

[2]E.R.E., XII, 411.

[3]C. S. Lewis, Miracles (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), p. 45. This writer gives us a very interesting account of the origin of tradition and the "impulse to conform."--"Chemical conditions produce life. Life, under the influence of natural selection, produces consciousness. Conscious organisms which behave in one way live longer than those which behave in another. Living longer they are more likely to have offspring. Inheritance, and sometimes teaching as well, pass on their mode of behaviour to their young. Thus in every species a pattern of behaviour is built up. In the human species conscious teaching plays a larger part in building it up and the tribe further strengthens it by killing individuals who don't conform. They also invent gods who are said to punish departure from it. Thus in time there comes to exist a strong human impulse to conform. But since the impulse is often at variance with the other impulses a mental conflict arises: 'I ought to do A but I want to do B.'" Lewis, of course, does not himself accept this explanation.

ponents. Our purpose is to determine to what extent this may be the case or if the prophets themselves may fairly be regarded as depositaries.

We must bear in mind, however, that it is possible to think of tradition in a more creative and dynamic sense than the above definition would indicate. Ideas, after all, are not coins or trinkets to be "handed over" in set form, but ideas are bound to develop and change as they are passed along. A. N. Wilder makes this clear in a passage which seems to be a dynamic definition of tradition:

> Just as an individual knows himself and feels his identity most clearly in certain memorable and crucial experiences of his past which become therefore normative for him, so a society knows itself and orders itself in the light of decisive experiences in its past which illumine existence. These common memories supply a people with what he [Karl Mannheim] calls the "primordial images" or "archetypes." They function as the rallying centers for group loyalties and cohesion. They take on symbolic and mythological development and thus more adequately objectify the faith by which the nation, or race, lives.[1]

James Moffatt has a similar conception of what is meant by tradition:

> In "tradition" there was an exchange between contemporaries. Something was handed on or passed over, it was true; but the something was not a thing, much less an abstraction . . . it was a shift due to the declaration here and now of some truth, or rule, or custom for life, personal or collective. Within it lay a spring of initiative which required a pulse of consent as it stirred the heart and mind, even when in the form of memories it continued to maintain its hold over some community or section of mankind in later ages.[2]

Wilder and Moffatt seem to be writing about the same thing;

---

[1] A. Wilder, "The Spirit of Our Culture," The Intersemi-nary Series (New York: Harper Bros., 1946), I, 146.

[2] J. Moffatt, The Thrill of Tradition (London: S.C.M. Press, 1944), p. 14.

Wilder emphasizes the past, Moffat the present process. Tradition for these writers has to do with some act in a community's history which becomes for that community a kind of norm by which life is to be judged. This act or event is interpreted by those who participated in it and witnessed it and by those who followed them. This interpretation may take the form of memory or myth.[1]

Periodically, in a given community, church or state authorities (or both together) will attempt to state exactly what the tradition is and to give the resulting document the force of creed or law. This happened in Israel in 621 B.C. and again when Ezra read in "the book of the law of Yahweh." In Christianity it happened, to cite but two of many instances, when the canon of Scripture was finalized and when the Chalcedonian formula settled the Christological controversies. Confronted with such a document as "the law of Moses" or the Chalcedonian formula, the religious leader faces a new problem. The subjective impulse to conform is now an objective order so to do. In revolting he is henceforth to be judged, not by the mere attitude of his contemporaries but by courts and officials not seldom given the power of life and death over him. In such instances tradition may be said to take a "solid" or "hard" or "frozen" form as over against a fluid one.

---

[1]Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 318: "A true myth is never invented; it is handed down. It is not true, but it is honest. From small elements which fancy offered as true, these myths arose and grew, without any contributor to their growth feeling that he had of himself added to them. Those only had any conscious intention in the matter, who touched up the oldest pure myths, and drew them into the great circle of their national history; and their intention, though conscious, was quite innocent and harmless. . . ."

Sometimes a religious leader will appeal over and against such an authoritarian concept of tradition to more primitive conditions and judge his present day by them. He will often be deemed a radical by his contemporaries, but standing against the creed or law of his day will often be to him an appeal to old and abiding truths against modern novelties, aberrations and distortions.

Thus we must distinguish (1) the dissenter who dissents in the name of tradition from (2) the dissenter who queries the very basis of his community's faith. We must also distinguish (3) the traditionalist who believes that in accepting the beliefs and ethos of his time he is adhering to the faith of the ages from (4) the traditionalist who sets ancient insights and ways against what he believes to be modern apostasies and errors. It is obvious that (1) and (4) are identical. Our question is the extent to which a given prophet is in this class or in class (2). The most superficial reader of the Old Testament should know that at least the pre-exilic prophets are never in class (3).

We will first try to describe the tradition with which the eighth century prophet may have been familiar. Our chief source is, of course, those portions of the Old Testament which probably antedate the eighth century whose leading ideas might have been familiar to the prophets, if not the documents themselves. We must then examine the eighth century prophetic oracles to determine whether or not they knew the tradition described in the earlier writings. To this Old Testament textual material must be added, where possible, evidence of an archaeological or

extra-Biblical nature that might be able to throw some light on the tradition in which the eighth century prophets stood. This will be followed by another careful examination of the prophetic oracles concerned to determine the extent and nature of the prophets' agreement with and dependence upon the traditions which we have outlined. It will then be necessary to note the extent and nature of dissent, if any, from these traditions. At this point we will be in the position to make some generalizations, as far as the eighth century prophets are concerned, as to the extent and nature of their dependence upon and revolt from the traditions they knew.

The book of Deuteronomy has been described as "the connecting link between old and new, between Israel and Judaism."[1] Since the time of DeWette it has been regarded, by the majority of critical scholars, as a seventh century production and also possibly as an attempt to give some of the ideas of prophecy the force of law. Does this document throw any light on our problem, the place of tradition and dissent in religious thinking? A discussion of the book of Deuteronomy will be followed by an examination of the authentic[2] oracles of Jeremiah to determine whether or not his attitude shows any change from that of his eighth century predecessors and also to see if the "canonization" of Deuteronomy has had any effect on prophecy.

---

[1] Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 362.

[2] This study purposes to be expository in emphasis, rather than critical. The critical position arrived at by scholars in what might be termed the Wellhausen-Driver school is taken for granted, at least in its main outline. The "authentic" portions will be those which are rather generally recognized as such by what the writer believes to be the consensus of scholarly opinion.

In conclusion the following questions will be discussed:

(1) What has the foregoing to tell us about the respective roles of tradition and dissent in religious insight and creative religious thinking about man and his relationship to God and the world.

(2) Would the prophetic attitude to tradition and dissent be a possible and helpful guide for the modern religious leader?

CHAPTER II

THE SHAPE OF THE RELIGIOUS TRADITION IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY

The Early Sources of the Old Testament

The Old Testament literature that antedates, or is contemporary with, the eighth century consists of a group of songs or poems now embedded in the text of the Hexateuch, Judges and Samuel, the earliest legal codes, the J and E documents and their sources, and the following historical material: the early portions of Judges, the early source of Samuel and the early source of Kings.[1]

H.F.D. Sparks classifies this material under five headings: myth, legend, history, poetry and law. In an oversimplified analysis of the early literature he sees myth in Genesis 1-11, legend in the patriarchal, exodus, wilderness and early conquest and settlement stories (Genesis 12 - Judges), and history proper beginning with the foundation of the monarchy. Law codes and poems are incorporated in the larger documents.[2]

Literary criticism has, over the years, been engaged in the task of identifying the limits of the different documents.

---

[1] R. H. Pfeiffer, An Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper Bros., 1941), pp. 21, 22.

[2] H.F.D. Sparks, "The Witness of the Prophets to Hebrew Tradition," Journal of Theological Studies, L (July-October, 1949), 131 f.

For a long time it seemed to be taken for granted that here we have only to do with documents that have been put together by a kind of "scissors and paste" method. It is now clear, however, that there is more behind the early traditions of Israel than literary documents. The work of such men as Gunkel, Gressmann and Mowinckel has made it clear that this tradition did not develop simply by the accumulation of literary documents. Behind the literary work was the life of the people: their worship, their songs, their stories, their heroes, their social controls. In Appendix A below we will discuss Mowinckel's account of the growth of the prophetic tradition itself. The pre-prophetic tradition undoubtedly was subject to the same type of development.

Yet even when all this is recognized and the discoveries and insights of archaeology are also taken into account, the really amazing thing is that the earlier critics did their work so well. Neither the newer traditio-historical critics nor the discoveries of archaeology have succeeded in upsetting their most important critical conclusions. G. E. Wright, in a paper which queries the Wellhausen evolutionary conception of the development of Israel's religious history, concedes "the continued recognition of the basic documents and the acceptance of certain dates for their completion."[1] While R. H. Pfeiffer's definitive Introduction (1941) shows the fruit of the critical, archaeological and historical research of the twentieth century, the really significant thing is that he has had to alter so few of S. R. Driver's

---

[1]G. E. Wright, "Biblical Archaeology Today," The Biblical Archaeologist, X (February, 1947), 16.

basic conceptions, though the first edition of Driver's great work came out in 1903. There are many differences in details, and Pfeiffer has discovered a few new documents, but the structure of the Old Testament in the two Introductions remains, for all practical purposes, identical.

We will not here attempt a survey of the literature in which the pre-prophetic tradition appears. This can be found in any good Introduction. But as we work through the eighth century prophets and Jeremiah we will attempt to discover what witness there is to the early tradition of Israel as it comes to us from the pre-prophetic pages of the Old Testament.

The Prophets' Knowledge of the Early Traditions

Amos.--In the denunciatory oracle on Judah we read:

> Because they have rejected the instruction (Torah) of Yahweh,
> And have not kept his statutes;
> But their lies have led them astray,
> After which their fathers walked.[1]

Unfortunately this passage is usually rejected. Harper rejects it because of its deuternomic tone, and especially the use of the term "statutes."[2] Sellin rejects the entire Spruch über Judah (vv. 4,5),[3] as does Pfeiffer who feels that verse five reflects the destruction of Jerusalem.[4]

---

[1]Amos 2:4.

[2]W. R. Harper, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea (New York: Scribners', 1905), p. 46.

[3]D. E. Sellin, Das Zwolfprophetenbuch übersetzt und eklärt, Erste Hälfte--Hosea-Micha (Leipzig: D. Werner Scholl, 1929), I, 206.

[4]Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 579.

This passage, however, introduces us to a prophet's use of the word torah and as the prophets' use of this term will be important as we proceed it might be well to note here Harper's excellent summary of the meanings which can be attached to this term:[1] (1) General instruction or direction from Yahweh,[2] (2) "technical direction given by the priests on specific matters of ceremonial observance and conduct,"[3] (3) "direction as to the general duty of an Israelite,"[4] and (4) "the direction formulated and contained in the Pentateuch."[5] It will be at once evident that this term, whenever it appears, must be subjected to careful scrutiny before one can with confidence refer it to a definite, formulated set of laws.

In the oracle on Israel we read the following:

> And it was I who brought you up from the land of Egypt,
> And led you through the wilderness for forty years,
> That you might seize the land of the Amorites.[6]

The use of the term "Amorite" for the inhabitants of Canaan is characteristic of E. The fixing of the length of the wilderness sojourn at forty years does not seem to have been made before Deuteronomy.[7] Its use here might seem to indicate one or more of the following alternatives: (a) an earlier date than 621 B.C.

---

[1]Harper, op. cit., p. 45.

[2]Prov. 1:8; Isa. 1:10, 8:16.

[3]Mic. 3:11; Jer. 2:8, 18:18; Lev. 11:46, 15:32.

[4]Deut. 1:5; I Kings 2:3; II Kings 10:31, 14:6, 17:13, 21:8, 22:8; Jer. 16:11.

[5]Neh. 8:1 f.; 10:34, 36.

[6]Amos 2:10.

[7]Deut. 2:7, 8:2; Exod. 16:35 --P.

for at least parts of D, (b) the tradition antedated D, possibly in oral form, (c) that this reference is a late gloss in Amos. Too much can be made of this, however, as the term is probably simply an idiom for something like "a couple of generations, quite a long time."

> But you made the Nazirites drink wine,
> And you laid command upon the prophets, saying,
> "You shall not prophesy."[1]

The Nazirite order probably came into being during the early days in Canaan as a symbol of nomadic resistance to vine-culture and agriculture generally. The reference to this order in the Samson story may be from an early source.

In the famous passage in 3:1,2 Amos shows once more his familiarity with some form of the Exodus story and here gives his startling interpretation of its significance. In his ironic invitation to sacrifice in 4:4,5 we may have a reference to the ancient shrines at Bethel and Gilgal, the former mentioned in J. The reference, of course, could be to contemporary sacrifices. The call for daily, instead of annual sacrifices, may be a reference to I Samuel 1:3, 7, 21 and the call to pay tithes every third day could be suggested by the Deuteronomic tithe required every third year.[2] The reference to burning the thank-offering of leavened bread is more difficult to assess. It seems to be a reference to Leviticus 2:11, 21 (P) and may suggest that this particular regulation of P was much older in practice. Amos 4:4,5 seems, on the whole, to suggest that ceremonial regulations antedated their codification in the custom of the people. In

---

[1]Amos 2:12. [2]Deut. 14:28, 26:12.

5:25 we have the repetition of the "forty years" formula and the assertion that "sacrifices and offerings" were no part of the wilderness tradition as Amos knew it.[1]

Hosea.--This prophet refers frequently to the wilderness period which he seems to idealize:

> She shall respond there as in the days of her youth,[2]
> As in the day when she came up from the land of Egypt.

> Like grapes in the wilderness
> I found Israel,
> Like the first ripe fig, on the fig tree in its first season
> I saw your fathers.[3]

In 3:4 we meet a list of interesting nouns: "For the Israelites shall abide many days with no king, no prince, no sacrifice,[4] no sacred pillar, no ephod and no teraphim." This verse reads very much like a post-exilic commentary on what precedes it. Even so, its reference is to the days before the exile and it has something to tell us of the religious objects then in use. Here, for the first time in our study, we meet teraphim which seem to have been something like the images of ancestors. They were consulted as oracles.[5] The massevah seems to have been connected with early shrines.[6] It is not quite clear whether the prophet

---

[1]Harper, op. cit., p. 136, translates, "Was it (only) sacrifices and offerings that ye brought me in the wilderness during forty years"--he comments--"this rendering places the emphasis in its proper place and does not compel Amos to say that there were no sacrifices or offerings in the wilderness." Harper takes the he of hzbchym as "he-interrogative" expecting an affirmative answer. But Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 236, believes that the wilderness tradition as Amos and Hosea knew it did not include sacrifices.

[2]Hos. 2:15b.

[3]Hos. 9:10.

[4]Harper prefers "altar" (op. cit., p. 220).

[5]Ezek. 21:12; Zech. 10:2.

[6]Schechem (Josh. 24:26); Bethel (Gen. 28:18 f.); Gilead

disapproves of this cult apparatus and refers somewhat ironically to the people's loss of it or if he looks upon it as legitimate and sees its loss as a calamity.

In the use of torah in 4:6 where the priest is said to have forgotten the "instruction" or "law" of his God, we cannot be sure whether the reference is to a written code[1] or instruction orally transmitted to the priest.[2] In 6:7 there is a reference to the breaking of a covenant. Here again we cannot be sure which, if any, historic covenant is meant, or if the expression means something like: "in a characteristically human way they have broken the agreement with me."[3] The verse, like so many in Hosea, is obscure, possibly corrupt, and its interpretation more or less guesswork. Harper would also reject the reference to both "my covenant" and "my law" in 8:1.[4] The present writer is not able to see the force of this objection which is not considered by Sellin.[5] But, once again, the exact force of the terms "covenant" and "law" is obscure. There are, however, in all of

---

(Gen. 31:45 f.); Mizpah (I Sam. 7:12); Gibeon (II Sam. 20:8); En Rogel (I Kings 1:9).

[1]Harper, op. cit., p. 255, suggests possibly Exod. 20-23.

[2]Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 56, does not see here a reference to any written code.

[3]The meaning of k'ādhām here is the subject of much disagreement. Kittel (Biblia Hebraica, 2d ed., fn. in loc.) suggests that the verse is corrupt. Several critics would amend to read "as Edom" (Harper, op. cit., p. 288). J.M.P. Smith renders it "As Admah" (a city of the plain). The Bible, An American Translation.

[4]Harper, op. cit., pp. 308, 309.

[5]Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 86.

these passages undoubted references to past history.

Chapter 8, verse 12, is another passage of importance for us. But, in the Hebrew it bristles with difficulties. Harper reads רִבֻּא ("myriad," "ten thousand") for רְבֻּא and also the plural form "laws." Rejecting a Hifil form for the first verb and rejecting both a present sense ("fails to meet the demands of the contdxt") and a future ("makes no sense whatever"), he accepts what he calls "the hypothetical force" thus giving us:--"were I to write my laws by myriads, as those of a stranger would they be accounted."[1] From this passage he proceeds to make the following deductions:

> (a) that in Hosea's time the custom was established of reducing instruction to writing; (b) the possibility of increasing the number i.e. a conception that the list was incomplete; (c) that the laws in existence were not being observed, although the prophets were defending them (cf. 4:1 f.); (d) that they were not ceremonial laws regulating the work of the priests . . . but rather prophetic instructions, laws relating to "civil justice and the application of a plain, but religiously sanctioned morality." (cf. the so-called Book of the Covenant, Exod. 20:23-23:33).[2]

Harper was preceded by Cheyne in this interpretation and rendering.[3] How uncertain this crucial passage is is seen by the quite different rendering of Sellin:

> Ich schrieb ihm 'deutlich' meine Gebote auf,
> Sie werden wie etwas Unverständliches erachtet,

and J.M.P. Smith who translates thus:

> I will write him down as an opponent of my law,
> He shall be considered as a foreigner.[4]

---

[1]Harper, op. cit., pp. 320-322. [2]Ibid., pp. 321-322.

[3]T. K. Cheyne, Hosea, with Notes and Introduction (Cambridge: The University Press, 1889).

[4]rubbē tōrāthī is emended to rab tōrāthī: i.e. rab as the

The rendering of Harper and Cheyne would indicate a very probable written torah in existence and known to Hosea. That of Sellin (deutlich aufschrieben--to write down accurately, or precisely) reveals an even stronger indication of such a code. But should we accept J.M.P. Smith, or the emendation רִיב for רִב suggested by Gratz and Oort we do not have the same necessity of admitting Hosea's familiarity with a definite, written code. The reference, however, is undoubtedly to some form of traditional instruction.

In the opening lines of chapter eleven we have a definite reference to the exodus-wilderness-settlement portion of the history, and a very beautiful and pathetic theological interpretation.[1]

> When Israel was a child I came to love him,
> And from Egypt I called him;
> The more I called them,
> The more they went away from me;
> They sacrificed to the Baals,
> And made offerings to idols.
>
> But it was I who taught Ephraim to walk;
> I took them up in my arms;
> But they did not know that I cared for them,
> With human lines I led them,
> With loving cords;
> And I became for them like him who lifts the yoke from
> their jaws;
> And I bent toward them and fed them.[2]

Qal participle of the verb rīb, to contend, argue, quarrel, etc. The only consonantal change is the deletion of a waw. This is appealing on the basis as a good parallel to zār. However LXX attests the presence of waw; it reads kai.

[1]But, here again, Harper, op. cit., pp. 361-362: "The MT here presents serious difficulties of text and interpretation."

[2]Hos. 11:1-4.

But the most explicit reference that we have in Hosea to the traditional history is 12:2,4,12:

> Yahweh has a quarrel with Judah;
> And he will punish Jacob according to his way;
> According to his deeds will he requite him.
> In the womb he seized his brother's heel,
> And in his full vigour he strove with God.
> Then he fought against an angel and prevailed;
> He wept and intreated him for mercy.
> At Bethel he found him,
> And there he talked with him.
> Then Jacob fled to the field of Aram;
> And Israel worked for a wife,
> And for a wife he watched sheep.

The references here are to Genesis 25:26a; 32:24 f.; 27:43 (all J); 28:10-22 (J and E); 29:18-20 and 31:38-41 (both E). Here the prophet may have access to some form of the tradition not in our sources. For in the Genesis accounts there is no record that Jacob "wept." In our stories, moreover, he entreats not "for mercy" but for a blessing.

In verse 13 of the same chapter we have a reference to Moses' leadership:

> By a prophet Yahweh brought Israel out of Egypt
> And by a prophet he was kept.

Hosea again makes reference to the Exodus story in 13:4. Chapter 13, verse 11, is taken by Cheyne and Harper to mean primarily the revolt of Jeroboam I and the succeeding revolutions and dynasty changes in the northern kingdom[1] but it may have in it at least an oblique reference to the story of the institution of the monarchy in the late Samuel source.[2]

Despite the fact that one never feels too secure in trans-

---

[1]Cheyne, op. cit., p. 123; Harper, op. cit., p. 400.

[2]Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 132.

lating or interpreting much of Hosea, there is no doubt at all that he was familiar with the patriarch-exodus-wilderness-settlement narrative in some form or other, and possibly some of the subsequent history.[1]

Micah.--In Micah there is very little historical reference. The words with which the prophet's dirge for Israel begins have about them the interesting possibility that they are an echo of David's famous lament which may have been recited or sung during this period. A comparison of II Samuel 1:20a with Micah 1:10a in the Hebrew shows a similarity which can hardly be accidental. Both passages must be translated: "Tell it not in Gath." Sellin, however, finds that the reconstruction of this passage is "most uncertain" (die unsicherste von allen).[2] George Adam Smith renders this line and the next as a prophetic pun:

> Tell it not in Tell-town,
> Weep not in Weep-town.[3]

If we accept the authenticity of Micah six and seven we have a really secure appeal to the historical tradition in 6:4,5:

> For I brought you up from the land of Egypt,
> And delivered you from the prison-house;
> And I sent before you Moses,
> Aaron and Miriam.
>
> My people, remember what Balak, king of Moab, planned,
> And what Balaam, son of Beor, answered him,
> From Shittim to Gilgal;
> That you may understand the righteous deeds of Yahweh.

---

[1]Hos. 13:10 may be a reference to I. Sam. 8:6 which passage is, however, almost certainly late.

[2]Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 314.

[3]G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), I, 383.

Verse four would seem to indicate acquaintance with the E form of the tradition (Aaron and Miriam do not appear in J). The story of Balaam appears in both J and E but the occurrence of the place-name Shittim here may indicate again that the writer knew the E form of the history.[1]

Unfortunately for our purpose, however, the majority of scholars regard chapters six and seven as belonging to someone later than Micah.[2] Thus we are deprived of the one solid historical reference in this book!

Isaiah.--There are very few, if any, genuine references to the historical tradition in the authentic oracles of Isaiah the son of Amoz. The Song of the Vineyard[3] may have been influenced by the hymns of the Tammuz cult, as has been suggested.[4] The whole poem, nevertheless, does suggest a long period in which Yahweh created, nourished and protected "the house of Israel" and "the men of Judah." Isaiah may have had some knowledge of the

---

[1] E. S. Brightman, The Sources of the Hexateuch (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918), in loc. reconstructs the narrative here as follows, attributing it to E: Num. 23:30--"Balak did as Balaam said; he offered up a bullock and a ram on each altar. . . ." The story picks up again at 25:1a--"when Israel settled down at Shittim. . . ."

[2] Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 589; Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 178; S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (13th ed.; New York: Scribners', 1908), p. 333. Though Driver entertains the possibility that the chapters may be by Micah, but late in his career. Per contra, G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), I, 360: "We ought not to overlook the remarkable fact that those who have written the fullest monographs on Micah incline to believe in the genuineness of the book as a whole." Scholars since Smith, however, have not concurred in this judgment.

[3] Isa. 5:1-7.

[4] M. Burrows, What Mean These Stones? (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941), p. 288.

story of David as told in the early Samuel source.[1] In his picture of the restored community[2] the prophet does allude to a period of history which may be the first days of David in his capital, a day when the city was "faithful" and her rulers governed by righteous considerations. In 1:9,10 the prophet makes reference to the destruction of the cities of the plain. Apart from these hints, and the use of the patriarchal name "Jacob," I can find no really definite references to the patriarch-exodus-wilderness-settlement tradition in the authentic oracles of Isaiah.

Summary of Survey of Eighth-Century Prophets

This preliminary survey of the prophetic literature of the eighth century would seem to indicate that at least Amos and Hosea were acquainted, in some form or other, with the historical tradition that we find in the earlier prose and poetic sections of the Old Testament. There seems to be no direct quotation of these sources so that it is not possible for us to say that the historical sources which they used were written. The probability is that both written and oral sources were available. What other, if any, documentary sources were used by them it is not possible to say. The present writer was able to find but one reference that could not be traced to present Old Testament sources. This is found in Hosea 12:4 where Jacob is represented as having "wept" at the time of the struggle with his mysterious assailant. In Genesis, moreover, Jacob intreats not "for mercy" but for a bless-

---

[1]Isa. 29:1, cf. II Sam. 5:7. [2]Isa. 1:21-31.

ing. Hosea may, however, be using our sources carelessly here rather than appealing to some other source. The latter possibility may, however, be entertained.

The evidence of historical knowledge is strongest in Hosea, despite the quite appalling condition of the text of this book. The evidence is also quite strong in Amos. There is no good, clear historical reference in what we have that is certainly Micah's. Nor does the authentic oracles of Isaiah contain a single reference to the Exodus. There is little evidence of historical reference in any form in Isaiah. This does not mean, as we shall see, that Micah and Isaiah make no appeal to the tradition. In dealing with Micah we are always handicapped by the paucity of the material.

The purpose of this survey was to determine the prophets' knowledge of the tradition. The question of their attitude to it will be taken up in the next chapter.

Archaeology and the Tradition of Early Israel

Archaeology has only a limited value for this study. We are not concerned with the historical accuracy of the tradition as much as with a description of the tradition as the prophets knew it.[1] Unfortunately documentary finds have not involved very

---

[1]It may be pointed out here that though some archaeological interpreters believe that they have succeeded in undermining the conceptual basis of "Wellhausenism," they generally admit the dates and general sequence of the main documents as outlined by the older literary criticism. Albright puts J in the ninth century, E in the eighth. He admits the 621 B.C. date for the publication of D, but he seems to accept the theory of its earlier writing and northern genesis as propounded by Welch. He places P for the most part at the beginning of the exile--W. F. Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible (New York: The Fleming

much historical, conceptual or religious material. There are few religious texts which have direct and unquestioned relevance to the traditions of early Israel. Our chief interest is in the archaeological descriptions of cult practices and cult objects which are dated in the earlier period. Of the recent excellent summaries the best, both from the standpoint of fullness and balance in interpretation, seem to be the present writer to be Burrows' What Mean These Stones?[1] and Albright's The Archaeology of Palestine.[2]

Archaeological discoveries of shrines and cult apparatus in Israelite Palestine have been comparatively few and fragmentary. On the whole we have to draw our portrait of them from the shrines and temples of contemporary people in the ancient near

---

H. Revell Co., 1935), p. 162 and pp. 146 f. See also G. E. Wright, "Biblical Archaeology Today," The Biblical Archaeologist, X (February, 1947), 16: "When it is sometimes said that recent study has done little to disturb the basic tenets of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, we should not fail to observe that the statement is confined to the continued recognition of the basic documents and the acceptance of certain dates for their completion. There is more, however, to Wellhausenism than this. It is primarily a reconstruction of the whole institutional history of Israel, based upon the assumption that the material within a given document is more of a reflection of the age in which the document was written than of the age which it purports to describe. Archaeological discoveries and the new perspective which they are bringing about make it increasingly difficult to hold this view without serious qualification."

[1]M. Burrows, What Mean These Stones? (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941).

[2]W. F. Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1949). Other excellent summaries are: Albright: The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible and Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1946); J. Finegan, Light from the Ancient Past (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946); C. C. McCown, The Ladder of Progress in Palestine (New York: Harper Bros., 1943).

east, or comparable Canaanite shrines. The temple of Solomon and its successors left no trace of themselves after their destruction[1] save perhaps part of the wall surrounding the temple area of the temple of Herod.[2]

The institution of sacrifice existed from early times and is described in the early narratives. In sacrifice the most essential object is the altar. In Exodus 20:26 we have the prohibition of an altar with steps. That such a type existed has been demonstrated by finds near the site of Zorah[3] and in Transjordan.[4] Horned altars and ḥammānīm (altar of incense?)[6] have been found dating from the Iron Age;[6] the one at Tell-Beit-Mirsim (Kiriath-sepher") Albright puts in the tenth or eleventh century B.C.[7] In the J source the incoming Israelites are commanded to treat the Canaanites in the following wholesale manner: "tear down their altars, smash mazzēbothām and cut down 'ashshērēhem. Archaeology has made some contribution to our understanding of these terms, but there is not yet general agreement among the interpreters.[8]

In the early Samuel-source we meet both the ark and the

---

[1]Burrows, op. cit., pp. 202 f.

[2]Ibid., pp. 206, 207. [3]Judg. 13:2.

[4]Burrows, op. cit., p. 209. [5]Ibid., p. 48.

[6]Ibid., p. 210.

[7]Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, p. 161.

[8]W. A. Reed, The Asherah in the Old Testament (Fort Worth: The Texas Christian University Press, 1949) contends that the asherah is a statue of a goddess, not a pole, tree, etc. I have not seen this book.

ephod. In Bailey's imaginary dialogue between Ahijah and a prince of Tyre we have a good summary of archaeological conclusions regarding the ark:

> It is now a gold-plated box of accacia wood about four feet long, fitted with poles on each side, by which the priests carry it. But this is His Majesty's casket for the real ark, which I suspect is a rude thing of baked clay in the form of a sanctuary. There are many such about; every high place has one (In I Sam. 14:18 called "ephod").[1]

This view of the ark--i.e., a miniature temple--comes from H. G. May. Regarding the ephod, Burrows accepts Thiersch's theory that the ephod is "a tight sleeveless garment worn by gods and their priests throughout the ancient Near East."[2] The Hebrew apologetic against idolatry, as seen for example in the ten commandments, is illuminated by some archaeological finds, the most common being the "clay plaque or figurine" of a goddess. One cannot always be sure, however, that an image or plaque is an idol in the sense of cult-image.[3]

Burrows also points out the great difficulty in reconstructing, from archaeological data, the picture of worship and sacrifice as actually practised. "Archaeology has not solved the vexing problem of the origin and primary significance of Israelite sacrifice." Ras Shamra does give us some description of Canaanite sacrifice, but we cannot be sure just how much Israelite sacrifice duplicated this.[4] The posture in prayer seems to have been standing with eyes turned upward, arms stretched out and palms also upward.[5]

---

[1]A. E. Bailey, Daily Life in Bible Times (New York: Scribners', 1943), p. 174.

[2]Burrows, op. cit., p. 216. [3]Ibid., pp. 218-219.

[4]Ibid., pp. 234, 235. [5]Ibid., p. 235.

Most important for our purpose, however, is not an archaeological find, but the deductions from archaeology of an archaeologist; W. F. Albright's argument for a primitive and Mosaic monotheism. Not only does he argue for an early date for monotheism, but for an early date for an extremely exalted form of monotheism:

> . . . the monotheistic point of view . . . [consists] essentially of the following elements: belief in the existence of only one God, who is the creator of the world and the giver of all life; the belief that God is holy and just, without sensuality or mythology; the belief that God is invisible to men except under special conditions (who doesn't believe that?!) and that no graphic or plastic representation of Him is permissible; the belief that God is not restricted to any part of His creation, but is equally at home in heaven, in the desert, or in Palestine; the belief that God is so far superior to all created beings, whether heavenly bodies, angelic messengers, demons, or false gods, that He remains absolutely unique; the belief that God has chosen Israel by formal compact to be His favored people, guided exclusively by laws imposed by Him.[1]

This early monotheism and universalism, demonstrated in the song of Deborah, believed and proclaimed by Moses, later degenerated into a narrow particularism revealed in such passages as I Samuel 26:19. The ecstatic prophetism of the eleventh century saved Yahwism from extinction, and prepared the way for revival under David whose centralizing tendencies were seen in his attachment of a chief priest to the court. "Monotheism formed an essential part of the Mosaic religion from the beginning."[2] But Albright makes a distinction between the "practical and implicit" monotheism of the early tradition and the "intellectual and explicit" mono-

---

[1]Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, p. 116.

[2]Ibid., p. 177.

theism of the sixth century: "The early Israelites felt, thought and acted like monotheists, even though their creed remained implicit for lack of analytic logic with which to formulate it from the raw materials which they possessed."[1]

This argument is presented in a more elaborate form in From the Stone Age to Christianity. The case for it seems to turn on the possibility of monotheistic tendencies at an early date as seen in the Aton-cult and other Near-eastern parallels. C.F.A. Schaeffer also sees a "monotheistic tendency" in the supremacy of El in some of the Ras Shamra texts; this tendency he can see as far back as the fifteenth century B.C.[2]

This argument, brilliantly presented by Albright, and sometimes somewhat less so by his disciples, cannot be yet regarded as proven. There seems to the present writer to be here a dangerous tendency to argue for the uniqueness of Israel's religion and her freedom from surrounding polytheistic tendencies and practices and at the same time to argue for that very uniqueness on the basis of tendencies and practices discovered in neighbor cultures. In a carefully reasoned argument I. G. Matthews defends the "orthodox" critical view[3] and he is not unfamiliar with archaeological and Near Eastern studies.[4] That we "lack clear evidence of a real monotheistic faith" prior to II

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 177, 178.

[2] C.F.A. Schaeffer, The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra Ugarit (London: The Oxford University Press, 1939), p. 60.

[3] I. G. Matthews, The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel (New York: Harper Bros., 1947), pp. 168-171.

[4] Ibid., p. 169--see esp. fn.

Isaiah is still the verdict of the documents."[1]

That archaeology is a valuable control in our understanding of the history of religions cannot be denied. But we must not allow this consideration to obscure the fact that the clearest source for the study of Old Testament religion is the text of the Old Testament itself. It seems clear to me that until archaeology and history succeed in upsetting the accepted chronological sequence of the main documents, such an "evolutionary" approach as we have in Matthews' book and in more popular style in H. E. Fosdick's A Guide to the Understanding of the Bible is still legitimate, for progressive development can most certainly be discerned by any unprejudiced reader.

The Shape of the Tradition in Eighth-Century Israel

The prophets of the eighth century were conscious of the historical tradition of their nation. In what exact literary or oral form (or both) this was known to them it is quite impossible now to determine. We cannot safely say, for instance, that Amos and Micah had the E document before them, Hosea the J document, or Isaiah RJE. But we do know that the patriarch-exodus-wilderness-settlement tradition (henceforth we will designate this tradition by the formula pEWs)[2] was known and from it the

---

[1]W. A. Irwin, a critical review of Albright's "From the Stone Age to Christianity" in The Journal of Religion, XXI (1941), 369.

[2]This formula is thus cited because the tradition is strong in the middle and weak at both ends. See e.g., W. A. Irwin, "The Hebrews" in The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946), p. 327: ". . . while the names 'Israel' and 'Jacob' are familiar designations

children of Israel derived their self-consciousness as a distinct nation. Albright sees behind this tradition a group of patriarch sagas, early cast into a single saga by a "poetic genius"--"an early saga of the Exodus and a saga--or group of sagas--of the conquest of Canaan."

> This group of sagas became standard throughout Israel, and perhaps it was officially sanctioned by the priesthood of Shiloh. After the division of the Kingdom--perhaps after the fall of Shiloh . . . the sagas became differentiated into a northern and a southern group, which continued to be transmitted orally. In the course of time variations were introduced, part of which came probably from local sources, as is certainly true of the traditions with regard to places and details of the Israelite conquest. Finally, after this double period of oral transmission these two groups of sagas were reduced to writing in the late eighth century (J) and the early seventh (E).[1]

Whether or not this is an exact account of events as they actually occurred, certainly something like this must have happened. It would seem that a new formgeschichtliche approach to the Hexateuch

---

for the nation and descent from Jacob is spoken of, mention of Abraham outside the Pentateuch is astonishingly rare until a quite late time. Since the old narrative documents incorporated in the Pentateuch commonly designated J and E, according to orthodox criticism, were already in existence before the age of the prophets, it is strange that these writers should pass over the impressive account of Abraham's call and the promise to him. References to the nation's history commonly reach back to the oppression in Egypt and the Exodus, in some cases the career of Jacob; but back of that all is blank. The meaning of this situation is difficult to appraise. One solution might be that the J-E stories of Abraham represent a little-known tradition which only through the growing prestige of the proto-Pentateuch won general acceptance about the time of the Exile, but familiarity with the story of Jacob was somewhat old." See also Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 161: "It is not the case that the Jews had any profound respect for their ancient history; rather they condemned the whole earlier development, and allowed only the Mosaic time, along with its Davidic reflex, to stand; in other words, not history but the ideal."

[1] Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, p. 147.

in the light of our present archaeological, philological, literary and historical knowledge might yield some fruitful critical results.

We can be sure of the following:

> The Israelites believed firmly that they had not always dwelt in Canaan; they had migrated thither out of Egypt; and even there they were not natives, but visitors; their real native country lay elsewhere.[1]

And we have enough evidence to fill in this outline at least to the extent that Kuenen did:

> Now as early as the eighth century B.C. the prophetic exhortations, after they had been delivered orally, were committed to writing; therefore it is possible that the prophets had such writings in their thoughts when they mentioned "the Thorah of Jahweh." Nothing hinders us from assuming that they also had in view collections of laws and admonitions to which a higher antiquity than even a Mosaic origin were attributed.[2]

Beside the pEWs tradition the elements of law and worship must be considered. The early laws of the Old Testament were partly native to the nomadic Hebrews and partly from the ancient civil law of Palestine. They were woven into pEWs at its critical point (just after the exodus in the E document) which seems to show that the compiler of the E sagas and RJE (who left them there) regarded the exodus as the crucial moment in Israel's history. That subsequent generations also so regarded it is evident from the most casual reading of the Old Testament.

Our knowledge of the worship of the eighth century derives from ritual prescriptions and accounts of worship and sacri-

---

[1]A. Kuenen, The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State, trans. A. H. May (London: Williams and Northgate, 1882), I, 104.

[2]Ibid., I, 55, 56.

fice in pEWs and the prophetic writings and also from the archaeological description of cult-objects and shrines. There is not much evidence that early Israel's worship differed drastically from that of her neighbors. In fact there is considerable feeling today that the worship which the prophets found is later than the wilderness period and was heavily influenced by the Canaanites. The final work of making detailed worship prescriptions and weaving them into pEWs was left to D and P.

Theology, if we accept the evidence of the documents themselves, was still rather primitive. Yahweh, the tribal warrior god of the early sagas (with more cosmic properties in the song of Deborah), the lusty, near-human companion of Adam and the patriarchs (J) and even David (early Samuel-source), did take upon himself transcendent qualities in E and as the giver of the Horeb covenant became the sanctioner of the group's morality and religion and the determiner of its destiny. Of the guardians of the tradition: the king and his officials (civil law and patriotism) and the priest and the cultic prophet (worship, religion, morality) we shall speak as we meet them in the prophetic oracles to which we now turn.

CHAPTER III

THE EIGHTH-CENTURY PROPHETS

Preliminary Remarks

In recent studies of Hebrew prophecy two questions have been most commonly asked. Because of our modern interest in psychology many scholars have asked: "Why did they say it?" and the emphasis, since Hölscher's Die Profeten in 1914 has been on "the prophetic consciousness." Especially has interest been focused on the element of ecstasy as both motive and authority for the prophetic oracles. Others, because of their interest in Near Eastern history and archaeology, have asked: "Could they have said it?" and the answers to this question have been derived, in part at least, from what others were saying at about the same time in cultures geographically proximate to that of the Israelite.

These questions are, of course, very important. But in recent times the tendency has been, perhaps, to stress them at the expense of literary criticism and exegesis. This tendency is something like the besetting sin of the theological student when he reads so many books about the Bible that he forgets to read the Bible itself! As we approach the prophetic oracles of the eighth century prophets and Jeremiah the questions which we will keep in mind are the following: (1) Did Amos (or whoever we happen to be dealing with) say this? (literary and historical criticism); (2) What, exactly, did he say? (translation and tex-

tual criticism where some doubt may be thought to exist); (3) What did he want his hearers to understand by it? (exegesis).

In this chapter we will take the eighth century prophets in turn and examine in each: (1) such passages as may reflect the prophet in the role of a defender of the tradition; (2) passages which may show a mood of dissent. We are interested in the historical tradition (pEWs). We are also interested in traditional persons--"depositaries"--the king, the priest, the cultic prophet. Traditional celebrations, worship, religious ideas, social ethics all fall within the scope of our discussion.

It is unfortunate for us that Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah did not have a Bible and "take a text." This convention in modern preaching would make the attitude of a modern preacher to the great Hebrew-Christian tradition more easy to assess. But the ancient Hebrew prophet "received his messages . . . not out of law or tradition, but through his own individual experience."[1] As we approach the eighth century prophets we must realize that the tradition in which they stood was of a fluid type for the most part. Possibly the Covenant Code, succeeding the J decalogue, had a force approximating that of law or creed, but we cannot be sure even of that.

Amos

The appeal to tradition in Amos.--In the few references that he makes to pEWs, Amos gives some evidence of an appeal to tradition in the oracle against Israel[2] and in the passage 5:25.

---

[1] Irwin, "The Hebrews," op. cit., p. 339.

[2] Amos 2: esp. 9 f.

After describing the "three-four" transgression of Israel Amos pictures Yahweh as pleading:

> Yet it was I who destroyed the Amorites from before them,
> Whose height was like that of the cedars,
> And he was strong as the oaks.
> But I destroyed his fruit above
> And his roots below.[1]
> And it was I, too, who brought you up from the land of Egypt,
> And led you through the wilderness for forty years,
> That you might seize the land of the Amorites.[2]

Pfeiffer rejects 2:10 as a "manifest gloss,"[3] but this rejection is not generally entertained. In any case, verse nine will serve our purpose. Amos is familiar with at least part of the E form of pEWs and his appeal here consists of a contrast between the partisanship of Yahweh for Israel and against the Amorites and the ingratitude of the people as seen in the transgressions listed in verses six to eight.

Pfeiffer also rejects 5:25 but this rejection, once again, is not concurred in by the majority of critics. We have already discussed the translation of this verse[4] and the question of Amos' attitude to sacrifice will be dealt with below.[5] The important thing to note here is the idealization of the wilderness period as a religious golden age to which, in effect, he recalls the people.

The critical rejection of the "doxologies"[6] in Amos[7]

---

[1]Amos 2:9. [2]Amos 2:10.

[3]Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 579. [4]Supra, p. 18, fn. 1.

[5]Infra, p. 47.

[6]Amos 4:13, 5:8 f., 9:5 f.

[7]E. Sellin, An Introduction to the Old Testament, trans. W. Montgomery (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923), pp. 168, 169 et al.

leaves us with but little material with which to assess his attitude to the traditional theology. Amos found the root of his idea of God in pEWs, but developed from it certain inferences beyond those of his predecessors--sometimes, indeed, at variance with theirs.

In ancient Israel our modern idea of the separation of Church and State would have been unthinkable. The office of king combines both civil and religious authority. The king is not only "Yahweh's anointed," but he is surrounded by religious advisors from whom he often seeks to learn the will of his God before embarking upon some project, usually military. The Oriental idea that "the king can do no wrong" was a determining force in the affairs of state by the time of Solomon.[1] The king is the depositary par excellence. In his person the tradition may almost be said to be incarnated. David's refusal, under what must have been overwhelming temptation, to touch "Yahweh's anointed" shows us to what length this veneration of the reigning monarch can go.[2] But it was by no means accepted by all ancient Israel.

---

[1]Irwin, "The Hebrews," op. cit., p. 305.

[2]S. A. Cook, The Old Testament, A Reinterpretation (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1936), p. 161. "In Israel Yahweh is king and Jerusalem is his throne (Jer. 3:17, 17:12; Ezek. 43:7). The human king is 'Yahweh's Anointed' . . . or 'Messiah.' He is formally adopted as Yahweh's son and first-born (I Sam. 7: 14; Ps. 2:7, 89:26 f.). The Davidic kings rule as deputies of Yahweh, and one can speak of 'the throne of David' (Jer. 22:30, 33:17), or of the king as sitting on Yahweh's throne (I Chron. 9:8, cf. 13:8). Any tendency to treat the king as divine would be contrary to the stricter Yahwistic monotheism; and in the popular didactic narratives the king is 'as' Yahweh's mal āk' (Zech. 12:8) even as Moses is to 'God-ward' in relation to the people, or 'as God' in relation to his mouthpiece, Aaron the prophet (Exod. 18:19, 4:16, 7:1). To curse the king was as heinous an offence as to curse God (Exod. 22:28; I Kings 21:10) and stories tell, per-

Nathan's rebuke of David, Absalom's and Jeroboam's revolt, and the successive dynastic revolutions of the northern kingdom show a tendency to challenge the authority of the king and, in some cases, to call him to subjection to the moral law and the will of God. According to Irwin:

> Except for a few utterances, mainly those of Hosea, which may well relate to temporary conditions, rather than to the monarchy per se, the prophets accept the kings as legitimate officials supreme in their sphere. Their demand was only that their rule must accord with the will of God. But nowhere do they suggest that the hierarchy possesses secular authority to rival the monarchy.[1]

In Amos what little reference there is to the king is critical[2] and it is quite impossible to assess the judgment of Amos on the monarchy as an institution on the basis of the oracles that we have. In dealing with Amos we must always remember that we have little material--the substance of but a very few oral discourses.[3]

---

haps for a purpose, how David himself would not injure his enemy Saul because he was Yahweh's anointed (I Samuel 24:6, 26:9, cf. II Sam. 1:16)." It is to be recognized that almost all of the passages cited here are later than our time but such a development must, of course, have a rather long history, and many of these attitudes and tendencies were undoubtedly displayed in the early monarchy.

[1] Irwin, "The Hebrews," op. cit., p. 357.

[2] Amos 6:1,2.

[3] J. Morgenstern, Amos Studies, Parts I, II and III (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1941), I, vii. This writer argues that the authentic Amos consists of a single discourse only. "This commentary will advance the thesis that Amos delivered only one, single address, on the New Year's day, at the northern national sanctuary at Bethel, an address the delivery of which did not require more than half an hour at the very most, one of the most logically and artistically perfect and oratorically effective and inspiring addresses in all literature." While this position is not generally accepted, it is clear that we have only a few prophetic oracles in Amos. See also Sellin, Introduction, p. 167: "For the most part his prophecies were uttered on the occasion of a visit to the feast at Bethel."

Very few modern preachers or writers would care to have their "views" on a great institution discussed on the basis of references to it in a small collection of sermons or articles. All we can say is that, as far as we know, Amos accepted the institution of the monarchy.

In Amos there is no extended controversy with the cultic prophet as is the case in Jeremiah. Amos himself disclaims any right to the title "prophet": "I am no prophet, nor am I a member of a prophetic order."[1] Yet he does seem to honor the title, declaring that Yahweh will not "perform a word" without first revealing his purpose to "his servants the prophets."[2] In the oracle against Israel Amos charges the nation with "laying command" upon the prophets, saying: "You shall not prophesy."[3] In view of this, it seems to me to be perhaps overstating the case to say that Amos repudiated "the entire prophetic movement of his day, with which he refused to be classified."[4]

That Amos did not completely repudiate as useless the traditional religious celebrations of his day is seen in 8:4-6. Although the main target of the rebuke here is the dishonesty of the merchant, there is also condemned his impatience with holy days because they involved suspension of business. The "new moon,"

---

[1]Amos 7:14: Even if Amos 7:10-17 is biography from a later hand, there is no reason to doubt the historicity of the conversation.

[2]Amos 3:7. [3]Amos 2:12.

[4]J.M.P. Smith, The Prophets and Their Times, 2d ed. revised by W. A. Irwin (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941), pp. 1, 2.

whatever its origin, was an ancient religious festival.[1] This is the first reference to the Sabbath in our prophetic literature and the attitude here is certainly one of acceptance.

In his social ethics Amos, though he repudiates the religious hypocrisy of his day, certainly stands in his national tradition. Even in the early stories in Genesis, where the writer is describing pre-Hebrew history there is very definitely the sense of "ought":

> Cain should not have killed Abel; the rampant "violence" of the time of the flood cried out to high heaven for retribution; the life and conduct of Noah was a standing rebuke to his contemporaries; the builders of the tower of Babel were guilty of arrogance, etc. . . . .[2]

Moreover the social ethics of Amos were in the spirit of the Covenant Code, if not indeed dependent upon it. This should be evident from the following comparison:

Exodus 22:26	Amos 2:8
If you ever take another's cloak in pledge, you must return it to him by sunset; for that is his only covering; it is his cloak for his body.	Garments taken in pledge they spread out, Beside every altar.

Exodus 22:21-24	Amos 2:6b, 7
You must not ill-treat a resident alien, nor oppress him; for you were alien residents yourselves in the land of Egypt (see also 23:9). You must not wrong any widow or orphan. If you ever wrong them and they cry out aloud to me, I will be sure to hear their cry, and my anger will blaze, and I will slay you with the sword, thus shall your own wives become widows and your children orphans.	Because they have sold the innocent for silver, And the needy in exchange for a pair of sandals; They who trample upon the heads of the poor, And thrust aside the humble from the way. . . .
	Amos 4:1
	You . . . who oppress the poor, who crush the needy. . . .

---

[1] I Sam. 20:5, 18, 24, 27, 34; II Kings 4:23.

[2] Irwin, "The Hebrews," op. cit., pp. 312, 313.

Exodus 23:6-8	Amos 5:7
You must not pervert the justice due your poor in his case. Avoid false charges; do not have innocent and guiltless persons put to death, nor acquit the wicked. You must never take a bribe, for a bribe blinds the open-eyed and subverts even a just case.	You who turn justice to gall. . . .
	Amos 5:12b
	You who oppress the innocent, take bribes, And thrust aside the needy at the gate.

Though it would perhaps be impossible to establish definite proof that Amos actually shows literary dependence on CC, certainly Amos 2:8 does seem to be a definite reference to Exodus 22:26 and Amos's social ethics, though he does not voice the concern of CC for the "resident alien" (who is possibly not now so conspicuous in the community), are certainly in the same moral climate as CC. In social ethics Amos stands squarely in the best tradition of his people.

The mood of dissent in Amos.--I. G. Matthews describes the eighth century prophets as "destructive critics of the time-honored institutions of their own day."[1] Our task now is to examine the relevant oracles of Amos (and subsequently his successors) in the light of such a statement. Albright and his followers challenge this type of statement and see in the prophets preachers of the ancient way of life.[2] We will now look for the mood of dissent and innovation--the mood of the radical reformer and "heretic."

It is frequently alleged that the universalism which we

---

[1]Matthews, op. cit., p. 121.

[2]Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 309.

see in Amos's doctrine of God and the nations is a departure and a new insight. This contention is based upon two passages: 3:2 and 9:7:

> You only have I known of all the families of the earth;
> Therefore I will punish you for all your wrong-doing.
>
> "Are you not like the Ethiopians to me,
> O Israelites?" is the oracle of Yahweh.
> "Did I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt,
> Also the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?"

That Yahweh is a world-God and has jurisdiction over all men is certainly not a new doctrine with Amos. In the early narratives Yahweh is the creator of the world[1] and man.[2] In the story of the tower of Babel[3] it is Yahweh who "did there confound the language of all the earth" and thus create the nations. Non-Israelites like Balaam[4] and Pharaoh[5] are under the control of Yahweh. In the song of Deborah the very "stars in their courses" fight--however they fight "against Sisera."[6] In the thought of Amos they fight also against Israel. Moreover the world-god idea seems to have attained critical self-consciousness in Amos.

But, here again, we must be cautious in our assertion that Amos breaks new ground. The doctrine "election means favoritism" did apparently become popular in eighth century Israel and found its expression in such eschatological conceptions as "the day of Yahweh." The "inviolability of Zion" idea is probably later than the eighth century. Such ideas had a rootage in <u>pEWs</u> in the promise to Abraham:[7] a promise which, in the earlier tra-

---

[1]Gen. 2:4b. [2]Gen. 2:7. [3]Gen. 11:1-9. [4]Num. 21:5, etc.
[5]Exod. 7:14-12,28 (J and E portions). [6]Judg. 5:20.
[7]Gen. 15:18 (J); Gen. 15:1b f. (E).

dition was, as far as I can tell, unconditional. But that the elect people, as individuals or as a people, were exempt from the consequences of disobedience and sin, was certainly not taught in the early traditions. The question of the permanence of the elect community did not arise before the Assyrian threat to its existence; it then found expression in the "Day of Yahweh" and "inviolability of Zion" doctrines. The latter we meet first in the book of Isaiah. It is in Amos 5:18-20 that we first read of "the Day of Yahweh."

> The belief in this day was older than any written prophecy. It was a popular expectation in the time of Amos. . . . The "day of Yahwe is . . . the day of Israel's vindication against their enemies through Yahwe. . . ."[1]

What Fullerton called "the archaeological school" of prophet-criticism argues that the Day of Yahweh conception and other primitive eschatological thought-forms arose from common Near Eastern myths (so Gressman) or from within the tradition, for instance from the exodus theophanies (so Sellin).[2] Whatever may be their origin, there is no doubt that in the days of Amos and Isaiah they were part and parcel of popular religious eschatological thinking. Amos did not repudiate this popular tradition so much as he transformed it:

> This popular conception, which was as unethical and nationalistic as the kingdom it was expected to establish, was adopted by the prophets and transformed into one of thoroughly

---

[1]R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity (London: Adam and Chas. Black, 1913; 2d ed.), pp. 87, 88.

[2]K. Fullerton, "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hope for the Future," The Journal of Biblical Literature, XLI (1922), 71 f.

ethical and universal significance.[1]

Amos's oracles against the king and his court[2] seem to refer in each case only to the immediate situation. If the biographical note 7:10-17 reflects an actual incident and conversation, and even if we concede a post-exilic origin to 11b, the statement of Amos: "by the sword shall Jeroboam die" shows a courageous independence of the royal house. It also shows Amos standing in the tradition of Nathan and Micaiah. Amos did not, any more than they, as far as we can tell, question the validity of the monarchy as an institution as did Hosea (as we shall argue) and the writer of the late Samuel-source (certainly). But Amos's type of independence must have prepared the way for the later, more radical criticism. The same attitude of critical acceptance may be seen in Amos's reactions to the priest and the cultic prophet.

In Amos we find a new method of prediction. The traditional method of mechanical divination devices do not appear here. Rather is the future described on the basis of moral causation. The coming woe of Israel is due to her privileged relationship with Yahweh combined with her moral intransigency. Here, in fact, is a really decisive advance in prophetic leadership for with the eighth century prophet we do have the real dawn of historical interpretation and prediction on the basis of observation, meditation and inspiration.

---

[1]Charles, op. cit., p. 87.

[2]In Amos 3:9,10 the court of Samaria is included with those of Egypt and Assyria. The 6:1-8 reference seems to be to the court. In 6:11 "that great house" the palace of Jeroboam II (?). The other reference is 7:10,11 of which the first verse is almost certainly authentic.

Here we must also reckon with the much debated question of the prophetic attitude to the sacrificial system. Was the criticism of Amos and his successors a criticism of the institution itself as Waterman and Matthews contend? The only way in which this question can be approached is by examining the relevant oracles to determine what the prophet wanted his hearers to understand by his words. The most important passage in Amos in this connection is 5:21-25:

> I hate, I spurn your feasts,
> And I take no pleasure in your festal gatherings,
> Even though you offer me burnt-offerings,
> And your cereal-offerings, I will not accept them;
> And the thank-offering of your fatted beasts, I will not
> look upon.
>
> Take away from me the noise of your songs,
> And to the melody of your lyres, I will not listen.
> But let justice roll down like waters,
> And righteousness like a perennial stream.
> Was it sacrifices and offerings that you brought me
> In the wilderness for forty years, O house of Israel?

It is clear, of course, that justice and righteousness are given precedence over sacrifices and offerings. If these words were spoken at the Bethel sanctuary, in the midst of the sacrificing, there is no doubt but that the participants in the worship would interpret them as a rejection of their cultus <u>in toto</u>. The question is whether or not Amos wanted them to be so interpreted. It seems to me that the key will be found in our understanding of the words:

> Was it sacrifices and offerings that you brought me
> In the wilderness for forty years, O house of Israel?

We have already seen that Harper believes that the context demands the translation: "Was it (only) sacrifices, etc. . . ." I cannot see the necessity for adding the word "only." There is a possi-

bility that the term "forty years" is an addition,[1] but apart from that the text appears to be in good shape and complete. Driver, it seems to me, is on more solid ground than Harper who inserts "only" simply because he does not believe that Amos could not have supposed the wilderness period to be one void of sacrifice.[2] Driver comments as follows:

> The question evidently requires a negative answer, and the emphatic words in the sentence are not, as has been sometimes supposed, unto me (which hold in the Hebrew quite a subordinate position) but sacrifices and offerings (which follow immediately after the interrogative particle). The prophet shows that sacrifice is no indispensible element of religious service, from the fact that, during the forty years in the wilderness which nevertheless was a period when, above all others, Jehovah manifested His love and favour toward Israel (ii:9,10)--it was not offered.[3]

Nor does Sellin translate this passage in anything but a straightforward way:

> Habt ihr mir denn Schlachtopfer und Opfergang dargebracht,
> In der Wüste die 40 Jahre, Haus Israels?

He comments that Amos here, with Hosea, follows an historical tradition (einer geschichtlichen Tradition) which knows nothing of wilderness sacrifices.[4] The likelihood of this gains force when we put beside the verse Jeremiah 7:22. If this is in fact the case, which it seems to be, we find that Amos is here appealing to an ancient tradition against the expression of a later one in ceremonial and sacrifice.

---

[1] Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, 2d ed. n. loc cit.

[2] Supra, p. 18, n. 1.

[3] S. R. Driver and H.C.O. Lancaster, The Books of Joel and Amos (Cambridge: The University Press, 1915), loc. cit.

[4] Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 236.

The other relevant passage is the ironic invitation to sacrifice in 4:4,5. The question here is whether the "transgressing" consists in sacrificing or in "the fact of engaging in worship though morally unfit."[1] Driver sees the transgression as twofold: "partly on account of the moral unfitness of the worshippers (ii:6,9) and partly on account of the unspiritual character of the worship."[2] For Harper "the transgression was . . . the fact of engaging in any kind of ceremonial worship for the purpose of finding Yahweh."

Modern preachers who "take this text" invariably see in it the condemnation of hypocritical worship. This may in fact be what Amos had in mind. But Amos nowhere advises or demands ceremonial worship, except perhaps where he condemns impatience with holy days on the part of merchants in 8:4-6. And even on the scene of a religious festival Amos mentions ceremonial only to criticize it and question its traditional validity. The weight of evidence, on the whole, seems to be with those who see in Amos a repudiation of the institution itself. We must, however, see that it is not as a radical or innovator that Amos attacks this practice, but as one appealing to an ancient tradition.

Hosea

The appeal to tradition in Hosea.--As we tried to demonstrate in the preceding chapter, Hosea is very conscious of the tradition. He refers to it more than the other three eighth cen-

---

[1]Driver and Lancaster, Amos and Joel, p. 169.

[2]Harper, op. cit., p. 91.

tury prophets combined. In his longest, and perhaps best-preserved oracle, 2:2-13, he uses his favorite figure of marriage to illustrate Israel's relationship with Yahweh. Although 2:6,7 (Heb. 8,9)[1] is ascribed to a "later voice,"[2] the role of Yahweh as the "first husband" is clear from the overall picture. Hosea tends to idealize the wilderness period, as a kind of honeymoon! But, forgetting the beneficence of her first husband, Israel

> decked herself with nose-ring and necklaces,
> and sent after her lovers.[3]

Because of this she must

> put away her harlotry from before her,
> and her adultery from between her breasts[4]

or Yahweh will

> strip her maked
> and place her as the day she was born.[5]

The same nostalgia for the early days is reflected in 9:10. In 10:9 the prophet traces the beginning of the decline to "the days of Gibeah." In 11:1-4 he changes his usual figure to that of a father-son relationship.[6] Israel is pictured as a child whom Yahweh called out of Egypt, taught to walk, fed, guided,

---

[1]We will cite the text number of the English versions, unless otherwise indicated.

[2]Harper, op. cit., pp. 236, 237.

[3]Hos. 2:13.

[4]Hos. 2:2.

[5]Hos. 2:3a.

[6]Even if we accept Harper's emendation (op. cit., p. 362) וְכַלָּה instead of כַּלָּה and taking וְכַ with the following verse, substituting in that verse וְאֶכְפָּ for וְכָפָ, the overall picture of a father-son relationship is quite clear. I must confess that I cannot see the necessity for this text-surgery here, but apparently J.M.P. Smith accepted it as the basis for his translation (see An American Translation, loc. cit.).

comforted. But Israel (Ephraim) "did not know that [he] cared for them" and instead of responding to his love they went away and sacrificed to the Baals. The point of the relating of the career of Jacob (Judah?) in 12:2-4,12 is not clear.

It seems to me to be sufficiently clear that Hosea does not reject the office of prophet as such, but the popular religious leadership of his day, in such passages as:

> The prophet is distracted,
> The man of spirit is crazed
> Because of your great guilt.[1]

But in 12:10 and 13 Hosea gives credit to the prophet (Moses is so labelled) for his great role in the early history of Israel and remarks that the prophet has been the recipient of "many visions" and "parables."[2]

Though Hosea does not seem to be primarily interested in social ethics, he does list cursing, lying, murder, theft, adultery[3] and deceit.[4] This list may show a knowledge of something like the "ten words" but more probably is simply a reflection of the generally accepted moral conscience of his nation.

We do not evaluate Hosea's appeal to the tradition by isolated references to events, persons and officials, but by the broad scope and plan of his prophecy and by his literary figures--particularly that of marriage. We can also see the force of his

---

[1]Hos. 9:7b.

[2]Harper, op. cit., p. 369, rejects verse 13 but accepts 10, which he translates "and I spake by the prophets--for it was I who multiplied visions and by the hand of the prophets gave parables."

[3]Hos. 4:2.

[4]Hos. 11:2.

appeal in the choice of certain favorite words, particularly the word shub.[1] When he uses this word, as either invitation or threat, he may be calling the people to "return" to a former high estate, unless the word has some technical cultic significance, as is suggested by Lindjo in his discussion of this word.[2]

Forms derived from the verb znh are also prominent.[3] There is little doubt that the idea here is more religious than biological and that J.M.P. Smith's renderings of its noun-forms as "apostasy" is quite correct.[4] Hosea, however, almost certainly got the idea from sacred prostitution in the Canaanite cults. The use of this term illustrates once more the prophet's conception of sin as unfaithfulness to a former relationship of love and respect, and to his contempt for the Canaanite cult.

The use of the much-discussed hesed in 6:4,6;[5] 4:1 and 12:6[6] raises the question of whether this word in this book carries with it the specialized meaning of loyalty to the covenant. Snaith, following Glueck,[7] insists on such an interpretation

---

[1]Hos. 6:1, 7:10, 11:5,6, 14:1.

[2]I have not had an opportunity to examine Lindjo's dissertation, but I understand that he sees in these passages evidence of a cultus of "returning to Yahweh."

[3]Hos. 4:12, 5:4, 9:1.

[4]znh is also used with reference to religious apostacy in Lev. 17:7, 20:5,6; Deut. 31:16; Judges 2:17. In Isah. 23:17 it is used of commerce between "gentile" nations.

[5]Translated "piety" by J.M.P. Smith.

[6]Translated "kindness" by J.M.P. Smith.

[7]N. Glueck, Das Wort Hesed, 1921.

here.[1] This is quite possible, though the word berith does not appear in any oracle of Hosea generally admitted to be genuine. The marriage relationship is, of course, a kind of covenant and in his use of that figure Hosea deals with the covenant idea. It is possible, moreover, to translate hesed by something like "loyalty to the vow" and get an intelligible result in all four passages:

> What shall I do with you, O Ephraim?
> What shall I do with you, O Judah?
> For your "loyalty to the vow" is like a morning cloud,
> And like the dew that leaves early.
>
> For I delight in "loyalty to the vow" and not sacrifice.
>
> Hear the word of Yahweh, O Israelites!
> For Yahweh has a quarrel with the inhabitants of the land
> Because there is no fidelity, no "loyalty to the vow" and
> no knowledge of God in the land.
>
> Therefore do you return to your God,
> Practice "loyalty to the vow" and justice,
> And wait for your God continually.

This interpretation of hesed in Hosea is in keeping with the mood of the prophet who comes to us not so much as a liberal reformer as an evangelist of the "old way" who revels in the real or supposed glories of the past and protests against the exchange of and old and tried loyalty for modern substitutes whose end will be misery and destruction.

The mood of dissent in Hosea.--The mood of dissent in Hosea is seen most clearly in his opposition to the king. Whether Hosea attacked the monarchy as an institution, or merely the present scandalous conditions, is a question that has been the subject

---

[1]N. H. Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 140-144.

of much debate. Supporting the contention of this paper, that the institution itself is under attack are Wellhausen, Smend, Nowack, Lods[1] and Matthews.[2]

Hosea 3:4, the authenticity of which is doubted by Pfeiffer[3] but accepted by Harper,[4] merely states that in a day to come the Israelites will be deprived of their king and prince. If these words are meant to imply that the loss of these--along with the loss of sacrifice, massevah, ephod and teraphim--would be a calamity, then we have here a kind of apologia for the monarchy. But, in view of the spirit of the entire prophecy, it is more reasonable to take these words to mean that Israel which has been unfaithful to Yahweh will, in the day of her visitation, be deprived of her lovers and playthings. This is in line with Hosea's plea for a return to nomadic simplicity and faithfulness.

In 5:10 (where we should perhaps read "Israel" for "Judah")[5] we are told that the nation's princes have become like "removers of the landmark" (kmaṭīnē gbūl).[6] Upon them Yahweh will "pour out" his "wrath like water."

The passage 7:1-7 is a vivid description of the internal corruption of the nation and the court. The king is portrayed as one who is made happy by all this corruption. Upon the very day

---

[1]Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 472. [2]Matthews, op. cit., p.123.

[3]Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 572. [4]Harper, op. cit., p. 220.

[5]Ibid., p. 220. See also Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, n. loc. cit.

[6]A reference to Deut. 27:17?

of his coronation[1] his courtiers plied him with wine until he was both sick and drunk. Those who surround the king are "hot like an oven" and in truth traitors who "devour their rulers." Here we have a very striking picture of court intrigue and corruption and, possibly, the northern dynastic revolutions. In itself it does not indicate repudiation of the monarchy but it describes a situation that could well bring about such repudiation in the heart and mind of a conscientious and truly patriotic critic. But, here again, we must note the almost certainly corrupt state of the text. This observation limits our deduction from this passage.

In 8:4a we do seem to have a clear-cut rejection of the monarchy:

> They made kings; but it was not of my doing;
> They made princes; but without my knowledge.

Both Cheyne and Harper make this refer to the revolt of Jeroboam I and the schism. But Sellin believes that here the prophet is thinking of the beginning of the monarchy in the days of Samuel and Saul: "er in dem Königtum eine Auflehnung gegen Jahwe gesehen hat."[2] I do not know how we can finally choose between these two interpretations. In favor of the first it may be pointed out that this oracle goes on to speak of things in Samaria[3] and Israel.[4] But a natural interpretation of a literal translation would cer-

---

[1]The expression "the day of our king" could mean, beside the coronation day, the day in which he was chosen, his birthday, or any festive day appointed by him (Harper, op. cit., p. 220).

[2]Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 87.

[3]Hos. 8:5. [4]Hos. 8:6.

tainly, it seems to me, show a bias on the part of Hosea against the very process of causing kings and princes to be:

> They caused a king to reign (himlīkhū)--but not from me!
> They caused a prince to be (whēshirū)--but I did not know!

In 9:15 and 10:9 we have two references which have led some scholars to believe that Hosea did indeed think in terms of the original institution of the monarchy. In view of 4:15 it is certainly straining to make "evil in Gibeah" in 9:15 refer back to the days of Saul. But a much stronger case can be made for 10:9:

> From the days of Gibeah you have sinned, O Israel,
> There they said that war would not overtake them in Gibeah.[1]

With this we must put 9:8b9a:

> The prophet--the fowler's snare is upon all his ways:
> Opposition is in the house of his God,
> They have dug a deep pit for him,
> As in the days of Gibeah.

We have already noted the fact that for Hosea the "honeymoon" period is in the time of the wilderness sojourn. Where and when did Israel begin to forsake Yahwey? "From the days of Gibeah you have sinned, O Israel?" An apostasy so deep and pervasive as that described in Hosea must be of long standing. Where did it begin to express itself? At Gibeah--so says the prophet clearly. And what events and persons of critical importance, at an early period in the nation's history are associated with Gibeah? The choice lies between the horrifying story with which the book of Judges closes and "Gibeah of Saul." In view of the anti-royal tone of Hosea, and in view of the fact that in the story of Saul

---

[1]The reference here could be to Judges 19:1-21:25.

the "prophet" Samuel figures prominently, it seems to me that the latter is the best choice. It must be remembered that Hosea does not adopt the "golden age of David" theme of Isaiah. "Since the days of Gibeah you have sinned, O Israel."

This line of interpretation would also account for the growth of the tradition of the prophetic rejection of kingship that we see in the late Samuel-source. The prophet today finds "opposition in the house of his God." A deep pit is dug for him "as in the days of Gibeah," when another deep pit was prepared for the prophet Samuel. Throughout the history of Israel the spokesman for Yahweh has met opposition--beginning with the day that the theocracy was exchanged for the monarchy.

To sum up, it seems to the present writer that such a line of interpretation is justified for the following reasons: (1) It accounts for the use of the term "days of Gibeah" here. (2) It is in line with Hosea's general view of the nation's history which puts the golden age sometime in the wilderness period, and must locate the beginning of the apostasy in the early days of the settlement. It must be admitted, however, that Judges 19:1-21:25 also meets this requirement. (3) It helps account for the growth of the later anti-monarchy attitude that we see in the late Samuel-source.

Harper rejects 10:3,[1] but neither Cheyne[2] nor Sellin[3] do

---

[1]Harper, op. cit., p. 344.

[2]Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 101, 102.

[3]Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 103.

so. Chapter 10, verses 3 and 4 is also a radical criticism of the kings:

> They speak mere words; they swear false oaths;
> They make leagues; and judgment will blossom forth
> Like weeds in the furrow of the field.

The final passage relevant for us here is 13:9-11 which most commentators accept, though Pfeiffer describes it as "of questionable authenticity."[1]

> I am your destruction, O Israel;
> Who can help you?
> Where now is your king, that he may deliver you?
> And all your princes that they may rule you,
> Of whom you said,
> "Give me a king and princes?"
> I gave you a king in my anger,
> And took him away in my wrath.

The usual way to interpret this is to make it applicable to Jeroboam I and the succeeding dynastic revolutions in the north. But Sellin sees here also the possibility of a reference to the institution of the monarchy in the spirit of "der jüngeren Erzählung von der Entstehung des Königtums."[2]

It is my contention that these passages, taking their impact all together and admitting that uncertainty of text often prevails, do show nevertheless a prophet who is critical of the monarchy per se. This is, of course, in line with his general attitude of antagonism to "what is" and his nostalgia for "what was." He is here appealing against contemporary traditions and institutions, as they find their expression in the monarchy, from the standpoint of the superior purity of the original tradition.

In 1:7 we find a verse which promises pity upon Judah.

---

[1] Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 572.

[2] Sellin, Hosea-Micha, p. 132.

Harper sees a later hand here, and with good reason.[1] But Cheyne accepts the verse with 4:15 and 11:12 and believes that Hosea shows a certain sympathy for Judah.[2] If the verse is genuine we do have a remarkable departure from the pEWs tradition, especially the early war-god songs where Yahweh indeed does deliver "by bow, by sword, by war, by horses and horsemen."

In 4:4,5 we have a denunciation of the priest, possibly also the prophet.[3] Because the priest has "rejected knowledge," Yahweh will reject him from the priestly office.[4] We do have the priest here as the depositary of the torah which may well in this passage refer to a written code. As the reference is probably to an individual priest we cannot argue that Hosea rejected the office of priest.

Hosea's attitude to sacrifices must be inferred from 6:6. Hosea 8:13 condemns the insincerity of those who offer sacrifices simply to fill their stomachs with meat, and 10:12 is clearly a reference to pagan sacrifices. Hosea 6:6 reads:

> For I delight in piety (hesed) not sacrifice,
> And in the knowledge of God rather than burnt-offerings.

This one verse is not foundation enough on which to build a con-

---

[1]Harper, op. cit., p. 213, gives the following reasons for making this passage late. (1) It is an interruption of the recital of Hosea's domestic history, (2) the expression "Yahweh their God" is not pre-D, (3) "other verses relating to Judah are suspicious," (4) passage reflects the "deliverance" from Sennacherib in 701, (5) the repudiation of human help is characteristically late.

[2]Cheyne, op. cit., pp. 43, 44.

[3]Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 570, rejects verse 5. For possible corruption of text here see Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, fin. loc.cit.

[4]Literally "from being priest to me."

clusion that Hosea rejected the institution of sacrifice. Probably we can agree with Cheyne who says: "The prophet thinks comparatively little of sacrifices, but does not denounce them as positively displeasing to God."[1] Hosea does not, however, commend sacrifice or invite the people to participate in it.

Amos and Hosea both insist on social righteousness. Both prophets also insist on religious fidelity. But for Amos the stress seems to be on the former while Hosea is most passionately concerned with the latter.

Micah

The appeal to tradition in Micah.--As we have already seen, Micah's words (those which we have) are situational and he is not concerned to appeal to the past. He accepts the God of the nation, Yahweh, and the ancestral name "the house of Jacob." But his mind, as far as we can tell, is so obsessed with immediate sin and immediate peril that there is little or no conscious appeal to history. Micah 1:1-3 is a curious passage combining the spirit of the primitive theophany with the spirit and scenery of later apocalyptic, except that the doom here is pronounced upon Israel rather than upon the foes of Israel. The sympathies of Micah for the oppressed and weak classes, like those of Amos, are in the growing humanitarian mood reflected in CC and developed later in D. There is little that we can say with confidence about Micah as traditionalist.

The mood of dissent in Micah.--Micah, as dissenter, ap-

---

[1]Cheyne, op. cit., p. 79.

pears in the oracle which we have in 3:1-12. The officials he denounces, their particular evil and their end, are as follows:

Officials	Their sin	Their end
(1) "heads of Jacob" "rulers of the house of Israel" (3:1)	injustice and oppression of common people (3:2,3)	Yahweh will not listen to their cry "at that time" (3:4)
(2) "prophets" (3:5) "seers and diviners" (3:7)	they "work for hire" give oracles in return for pay (vv. 5, 11)	the loss of their "gifts" (3:4)
(3) "priests" (3:11)	"declare oracles for hire" (3:11)	not specific. They will share in the general destruction

> Therefore, because of you
> Zion shall be ploughed like a field,
> And Jerusalem shall become a ruin.
> And the temple a high place in the forest.[1]

Though Micah does not use Amos's term "day of Yahweh," he refers to it, or a similar popular eschatological conception[2] and transforms it into a day of judgment on Israel, exactly as does Amos and Isaiah.

Isaiah

The appeal to tradition in Isaiah.--Because of its great bulk Isaiah 1-39 presents us with many more problems in the realm of criticism. For the purpose of this paper we are accepting the conclusion so cogently and brilliantly stated and argued by Fullerton in 1922. Fullerton sees the heart of the prophecies of Isaiah the son of Amoz in the following passages: Chapter 1; 2: 6 - 4:1; 5:1-26; 6:1 - 8:18; 9:7 - 10:4; 28:1-4, 7-22; 29:1-4,

---

[1]Mic. 3:12.

[2]Mic. 1:2-4.

9-15; 30:1-17 and 31:1-4.[1] That genuine Isaianic tradition underlies other passages cannot be doubted. But the passages cited are almost certainly genuine and they give us enough material to assess Isaiah's main ideas.

As we have seen there is little or no direct reference to pEWs in Isaiah. In Isaiah 1:9,10 the prophet does refer to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. But in the general tone of his oracles we see something of the extent of his indebtedness to and acceptance of tradition. Like Hosea, Isaiah at times does seem to idealize the past:

> How she has become a harlot,
> The once-faithful city,
> She that was full of justice, in whom righteousness lodged,
> But now murderers.[2]
>
> I will turn my hand against you;
> And will smelt out your dross in the furnace,
> And remove all your alloy.
> Then I will restore all your rulers as at first,
> And your counsellors as in the beginning.[3]

These words are from the passage which contains the substance of Isaiah's hope for the future.[4] But whereas Hosea located the golden age of the past in the time of the wilderness sojourn, Isaiah seems to put it in the days when David first occupied Jerusalem.

In the song of the vineyard,[5] whatever its mythological background, we have what might be termed the crystallization of the prophet's conception of the meaning of the nation's history.

---

[1] Fullerton, "Viewpoints in the Discussion . . . ," op. cit., p. 70.

[2] Isa. 1:21.

[3] Isa. 1:25,26a.

[4] Isa. 1:21-31.

[5] Isa. 5:1-7.

Hosea pictured Yahweh as the nation's husband; Isaiah here pictures him as one who cultivates the vine whose vineyard is the "house of Israel" and whose vines are "the men of Judah." In the past the divine vineyard-owner has cared for his possession:

> My Loved One had a vineyard,
> On a fertile hill;
> He dug it and cleared it of stones,
> And planted it with choice vines;
> He built a watchtower in the midst of it,
> And hewed out a winevat. . . .

In his extensive list of ornaments and ornamental clothing for feminine adornment[1] there may be a trace of the nomadic strain of the ancient prophet of the Elijah type in Isaiah. But it is only a trace. Isaiah is not an opponent of civilization as such. He is the adviser of kings[2] and one who reflects on his nation's condition as an era ends.[3]

The setting of the call of Isaiah is almost certainly the temple.[4] Thus we see that he does not repudiate the royal shrine, despite his disgust with the sacrificial system,[5] but participates in either public or private worship there.

Isaiah's emphasis on justice, the rights of the weaker element in society and the necessity of strict justice are in the tradition of CC-D. If there is a distinctive element in his teaching about sin, it is in the conception of the holiness of God, which acts as a kind of foil, magnifying the sin of man. In

---

[1] Isa. 3:18-23. Probably an expanded list.

[2] Isa. 7:3 f.

[3] Isa. 6:1.

[4] D. K. Marti, Das Buch Jesaja (Tübingen, 1900), p. 64.

[5] Isa. 1:10 f.

his first reaction to the divine vision the prophet cries:

> Woe to me! for I am lost;
> For I am a man of unclean lips,
> And I dwell among a people of unclean lips
> For my eyes have seen the king,
> Yahweh of hosts.[1]

The temple vision in Isaiah 6 does recall E's magnificent account of the Horeb theophany.[2] There we have the reaction of fear at the prospect of a too-close contact with deity.[3] But this fear does not have the moral content of Isaiah 6:5.

The mood of dissent in Isaiah.--Those who composed and began to put together the sagas, songs and narratives that made up pEWs were confident that Yahweh was the God of the Israelites, and that he would always fight for them. Sometimes he would use supernatural means, as when the presence of the sacred box confounded the Philistines or the lengthened day helped the Israelites. But, generally speaking, Yahweh worked through men, weapons, horses, armies and military alliances. The weapons of the holy war were definitely materialistic.

It is a selfish, nationalistic faith that Isaiah questions. He sees no hope in either military alliance or in preponderance in armaments:

> Your covenant with Death will be annulled
> And your compact with Sheol will not stand.
> When the overwhelming scourge passes
> You will be battered down by it.[4]
>
> "By returning and rest shall you be saved--
> In quietness and confidence shall be your strength."
> But you refused to listen, and said,

---

[1] Isa. 6:5.

[2] Exod. 20:18 f.

[3] Exod. 20:19.

[4] Isa. 28:18.

"No, upon horses will we flee."
Therefore you shall flee!
"And upon swift steeds shall we ride",
Therefore swift shall be your pursuers!
At the challenge of one a thousand shall flee,
Till you are left like a flagstaff upon the top of a mountain,
Like a beacon on a hill.[1]

Thus Isaiah does not admit that Yahweh will automatically guarantee the perseverance of Israel. But Isaiah does keep what is true and valuable in the ancient outlook--faith in the perseverance of the believing community--in his doctrine of faith and his idea of the remnant. Whatever the Immanuel sign[2] may mean, it does certainly mean that Yahweh is still the God of Israel and Israel is still the people of Yahweh. The secret of the strength of the people of God is their faith and without faith they are as vulnerable as any other:

If you do not hold fast,
Surely you shall not stand fast.[3]

But, looking into the immediate future, Isaiah could see only the "overwhelming scourge" and the doom of the nation Judah. This nation is a tree which must be felled. But the stump of the tree must remain--and the prophet left his hearers (or readers) to realize that a stump often sprouts new life. A later commentator, in the spirit of Isaiah, adds the explanatory note--"a holy race is the stump of it."[4] The presence of Isaiah's son, with the symbolic name Shearjashub, when Isaiah met Ahaz during the

---

[1]Isa. 30:15b-17. [2]Isa. 7:14. [3]Isa. 7:9b.

[4]Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 422, says that 6:12 f. is spurious, a clumsy attempt on the part of a commentator to assuage the doom pronounced. I cannot accept this excision. The words in the passage are not too clear and the original text has perhaps been tampered with. But its tone is well in accord with Isaiah's ideas.

Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, symbolizes his hope--"a remnant shall return." Pfeiffer sums up Isaiah's doctrine of the remnant as follows:

> In giving to his first-born son this emblematic name at the very beginning of his ministry, Isaiah wished to sum up the import of his message. He was already convinced that Israel and Judah were doomed. At the same time he could not force himself to see the doom as complete and final, like Amos who sang a dirge over Israel which he envisages as prostrate in death (Amos 5:2). The catastrophe would serve to remove the dross, leaving a remnant of pure metal; Jerusalem would become a city of righteousness (1:24-25) after the ordeal. In thus naming his son "Shearjashub", Isaiah was filled with conflicting emotions; righteous anger at his people's wickedness, awe before the just sentence of doom pronounced by the God of holiness, and withal a glimmer of hope that a small remnant of the people would finally return to Yahweh.[1]

In his "day of Yahweh" passage,[2] Isaiah treats this popular eschatology in exactly the same way as does Amos. Another popular eschatological notion, connected with the day of Yahweh idea, is the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion. That Isaiah does not accept this is fully demonstrated by Fullerton, at least to the satisfaction of the present writer.[3] The seed of Isaiah's hope for the future is to be found in his faith-remnant conception and the expression of this hope only, but adequately, in 1:21-31.

It would seem, then, that Isaiah's view of history preserves what is valuable in the old tradition, while he sets his

---

[1] Ibid., p. 325. Sometimes, however, this name is interpreted to mean "only a remnant shall return" and thus the emphasis would be on the doom rather than the hope.

[2] Isa. 2:12 f.: "for Yahweh of hosts has a day. . . ."

[3] Fullerton, "Viewpoints in the Discussion . . . ," op. cit., pp. 12-14.

face against some features of that tradition. The sacred community will persist though the nation perish but the rock of that persistence is faith; neither might, nor the automatic favoritism of Yahweh. From the ruins and ashes of a defeated nation, and perhaps even a pulverized capital, the city of God will rise once more, full of justice and righteousness as in the days of David. Isaiah seems to be the first to idealize the days of David rather than the time of Moses. In this respect he was to be followed by the Chronicler.

Isaiah's attitude toward the civil and religious leaders of the people is vividly presented in 9:15,16. Yahweh is about to cut both the head and the tail off of Israel:

> The elder and the man of rank is the head,
> And the prophet who teaches lies is the tail.
> The leaders of the people were misleaders
> And those who were led by them were swallowed up.

"Priest and prophet" are described as drunken, stumbling, vomiting leaders, reeling at the very moment of their visions.[1] Isaiah pays scant attention to religious and civil officialdom and he mentions it only in scorn.

Isaiah's reaction to sacrifice and ceremonial is given in full in 1:11 f. Our decision as to whether his attitude is one of complete rejection of the institution or merely radical criticism of the present practice hinges, it seems to me, on verse 12:

> When you come to visit me,
> Who demands this of you--the trampling of my courts?

Does not this question constitute a challenge to the very credentials of the whole system? In verse 13 an offering is labelled

---

[1]Isa. 28:7.

shāwe'--emptiness, vanity, worthlessness. Before we come to the conclusion, however, that Isaiah is opposed to ceremonial and sacrifice in itself, we must remind ourselves that his strictures here on insincere private prayer and devotion are just as strong.[1] Does this mean that Isaiah is also opposed to prayer and devotion? Did he himself not receive his call while engaging in just such an exercise.

Isaiah, however, never advises or urges sacrifices and his vision of the redeemed community[2] does not mention sacrifice after the manner, for example, of the writer of Psalm 51:19.

Isaiah's concern, after the manner of Amos and Micah, for the weak and oppressed classes[3] and his anger at the injustices wrought upon them, does not blind him to the fact that they share in the general sin and will participate in the general doom.[4]

The Eighth-Century Prophet as Traditionalist

In two recent and very able papers A. R. Johnson[5] and Claude Sauerbrei[6] have described the role of the "cultic prophet" and "holy man" in ancient Israel. Both of these papers demonstrate, it seems to the present writer, the "unity of the religious movement, and specifically the prophetic movement in Israel."[7] Amos disclaimed any part or lot in the contemporary pro-

---

[1]Isa. 1:15. [2]Isa. 1:21-31.

[3]Isa. 1:17, 3:14,15. [4]Isa. 9:17.

[5]A. R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board, 1944).

[6]C. Sauerbrei, "The Holy Man in Israel," The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, VI (October, 1947).

[7]Ibid., p. 209.

phetic movement, it is true,[1] but he is not without sympathy for the prophets whom he describes as Yahweh's "servants."[2] The term "false prophet" is not used in these eighth century oracles, or indeed anywhere in the Old Testament. Just as the charismatic preacher in the store-front Pentecostal church, the Pope on his "throne" and the liberal occupant of a suburban Protestant pulpit today are "digged" from the same "pit" and "hewn" from the same "rock" (despite their mutual denunciations of one another) so Moses, Deborah, Samuel, Saul, Nathan, Elijah, Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, despite their differences of emphasis and conception are heirs of, and participants in, a common tradition.

> The form--and the term includes not only the outward manifestations of prophecy, but also the psychic phenomena which characterized it, remained essentially the same for the new prophets as for their predecessors; it was the spiritual content of the ancient form that was the new thing.[3]

In the early days "prophecy was a conservative force" in Israel.[4] To what extent did this remain true of eighth century prophecy? Before attempting to answer this we must caution ourselves by reminding ourselves that it is no more possible to

---

[1] Amos 7:14. [2] Amos 3:7.

[3] A. Lods, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, trans. S. H. Hooke (London: Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1937), p. 52. See also Smith and Irwin, op. cit., p. 12.--"There is no sharp break between the early prophets and the great prophets of later times. The transition . . . was a process of normal, natural growth. The prophets grew with the nation. As the nation was more and more drawn into the whirl of international politics, the outlook of the prophets widened, their faith deepened, and the nature of their prophesying gradually underwent a transformation."

[4] Lods, op. cit., p. 51. See also J.M.P. Smith, "The Conservatism of Early Prophecy," The American Journal of Theology, Vol. XXIII (July, 1919).

stereotype these four prophets than it would be to set forth detailed generalizations describing the attitude of, for example, four twentieth century Methodist ministers, as if all four presented a common, uniform viewpoint on all matters of faith and behaviour. That the eighth century prophets were all informed by essentially the same spirit is almost certainly true, but we have already progressed sufficiently in this investigation to know that there is just as surely variety of attitude and interpretation in eighth century prophetic religion.

Hosea might be described as the one who could most easily wear the label "conservative." He posits a golden age of loyalty in the past to which he bids an apostate nation return. He makes the greatest number of explicit references to pEWs, especially the wilderness part of it--but he seems to be fairly familiar with the entire tradition. He comes closer perhaps than the others to the modern custom of "taking a text." He does not seem to repudiate the historic institution of prophecy.[1] "Back to nomadism" might be his slogan.[2]

Of Micah we have such a scarcity of material, and that of a situational nature, that we can say little of him as a traditionalist or otherwise. It seems fairly safe to say that his attitudes are much like those of his contemporary, Isaiah.

Isaiah as a traditionalist must be judged on the basis of his general spirit and underlying assumptions because he does not

---

[1]Hos. 12:10-13.

[2]Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 239. "Hosea's ideal is a return to the simple, semi-nomadic life of antiquity; eschewing both the comforts and the attendant evils of civilization."

make explicit reference to the great heroes of the past and to pEWs. Of these heroes only David is referred to, and he very sparsely. Isaiah does not mention, or as far as I can tell, even allude to, Moses and the exodus. If there is Isaianic tradition behind chapter nineteen, for instance, it is passing strange that in a discussion of Egypt no reference is made to Moses, the captivity or the exodus. Is it possible that Isaiah has not heard of these events? But, as we have seen, Isaiah does share to a small extent, Hosea's idealization of the past. For Isaiah, however, the golden age seems to be the first days of the Jerusalem of David. His hope for the future is in terms of a return to those days.[1]

In dealing with Amos we have to take into account the fact that much of our material (Morgenstern argues all of our genuine material) comes from one sermon. We do not have the viewpoint of a career as we seem to have in the case of Isaiah and Hosea. In two places, as we have seen, Amos does seem to appeal to pEWs and to the traditional Yahweh-Israel relationship. There is no evidence that Amos rejected the office of prophet, priest or king as such, and that he did not object to the holding of holy days is seen in 8:4-6. Amos's social ethics are in the tradition of CC. I can see no evidence that Amos supported the institution of sacrifice.

Hosea is a traditionalist. Amos and Isaiah show surprisingly little interest in the tradition in which they stand.

In view of what might be called the "pan-covenantism" of

---

[1]Isa. 1:21-31.

much contemporary Old Testament theological thinking, it is interesting to note that an appeal to the covenant in a formal, technical sense is not once made by any of these four. That is we do not have a single instance where the word berith is used in a genuine oracle, that the covenant is a formal undertaking entered into at a given time and place by the whole nation.

As far as we can know the eighth century prophets were not related to a tradition of the creed or book type. The tradition in which they stood had its literature, its ceremonies, its depositaries, but these were, it seems, largely accepted by common social consent. That there were laws is seen in the existence of the Covenant Code. But whether or not CC was ever proclaimed and given the force of law (apart from those parts of it incorporated into Deuteronomy), before the "enactment" of the whole Pentateuchal legislation in the days of Ezra, is not clear. It is beyond doubt that the tradition in which Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah stood was largely of a fluid type. The question of a prophet's relationship to a tradition of the "hard" type first rises with Jeremiah and Deuteronomy.

The Eighth-Century Prophet as Dissenter

That these prophets were critics of some of the time-honored traditions of their day cannot be denied. For some of these institutions they saw only destruction. For the nation as a whole they saw destruction. If this constitutes "destructive" criticism, then destructive critics they were.

The idea of history that we find in pEWs is certainly subjected to criticism and drastic revision and, in some cases,

rejection. All four of our prophets foresee the coming fall of their nation. That Judah did not fall during the Assyrian period does not detract from their historical insight. Amos, Micah and Hosea are straight prophets of doom. The nation will fall. Isaiah, with his faithful remnant idea and his vision of the restoration retains the persistence-of-the-sacred-community motif which underlies the Warrior-God and Champion of Israel pictures of the early songs and sagas. Isaiah, and even more Hosea see a golden age in the past. Isaiah sees a return to this past. Hosea does not. Hosea's criticism of the present issues from his idealization of the past.

Hosea locates the beginning of the apostasy from the early days of the settlement, very possibly precisely at the time of the institution of the monarchy. Hosea is at least a radical critic of this institution and the case for those of us who believe that he opposed the institution itself is almost, if not quite, conclusive. All four prophets are critics of prophet, priest and king--at least as these worthies are presently functioning.

Sacrifice and ceremonial are made subordinate to social righteousness in Amos, Micah and Isaiah and to religious fidelity in Hosea. Nowhere does any one of these four prophets, in so much as a single verse or hint, recommend or urge participation in the sacrifical cult as a desirable thing. Though admittedly an argument from silence, this is the strongest fact in the case of those who claim for these prophets the repudiation of cult practice.

The prophets of the eighth century were not only critics, destructive or otherwise, of "time-honored institutions," they were also critics of certain currently popular notions, especially eschatological ones. Amos, Micah and Isaiah see the "day of Yahweh" as a day not of vindication, but of judgment and punishment, for Israel. Micah certainly,[1] and Isaiah probably, repudiate the idea of the inviolability of Zion. Isaiah's philosophy of history (if such it can be called) preserves the traditional concept of the perseverance of the faithful community. His faith-remnant ideas constitute the small but firm link between the immediate judgment and destruction and the coming restoration.

Concluding Generalization on Eighth-Century Prophecy

The eighth century prophets were children of Israel. As such they were the heirs of the religious tradition of Israel. They were its heirs even when they said little or nothing about their heritage. In a very real sense they were the products of this tradition and as far as we know their precise kind was not produced by any other, nor could it be.

Of the four Hosea can most properly be labelled "traditionalist." For his plea is a call to return to the old ways. In the wilderness period Israel had been faithful to Yahweh. At some point in her history, most probably when she adopted that symbol of contemporary civilization, the monarchy, she began to fall away, to become disloyal to her vows, to seek other lovers. Hosea stands as the type of religious leader whose function is to call

---

[1] Mic. 3:12.

people "back." He is a perennial type and his plea usually finds a response in the hearts and minds of nostalgically minded people, unless his primitivism is too crude, in which case he is dismissed as a fanatic.

Because of this nostalgia for the old ways, Hosea is the opponent of modern developments of the tradition, the evil of which he sees summed up and most clearly demonstrated in the court. To this writer it seems likely that Hosea was opposed to the institution of the monarchy as such. Though Hosea does not seem to have been a Rechabite, there is in his mind a preference for the simple, nomadic ways of his fathers.

Isaiah, on the other hand, was the most "civilized" of the four. And because he identifies himself most thoroughly with the worldly affairs of Judah, his criticism of contemporary politics, international policies, institutions and religious practices is, by that very token, the more courageous. It is a much more simple matter for a hermit to be a radical critic than for a practical politician!

Isaiah does not make Hosea's appeal to the primitive tradition. In fact for Isaiah Israel's history does not seem to begin with Moses at all, but with David. Isaiah's religion has none of the nostalgia that we see in Hosea. His dedicatory experience seems to have come when he was at worship in the temple. And from this direct apprehension of God proceeded his convictions as to what Yahweh required of the nation during that period of ever-recurring crisis. Isaiah never as much as glances back at the exodus for inspiration and ideas. He does not conceive

of a solution in terms of a return to anyone or anything--although the result of the coming purge will be the restoration of better early days. In the Syro-Ephraimitch crisis we see him handling the situation from the standpoint of his experience, observation and judgment and boldly predicting the future on the basis of that judgment.

Apart from the fact that he is as much as Hosea the heir of the religious tradition of ancient Israel, Isaiah could not be called a traditionalist. Nor could he be called a dissenter exactly. He is rather what I choose to call a "situational" prophet with little or no antiquarian interest.

It is quite impossible to generalize about Micah due to the scarcity of authentic material. Micah seems, however, to share the spirit and viewpoint of Isaiah.

In view of the fact that we see Amos on but a few occasions it is not too easy to assess his general attitude toward the tradition. We do know that he is compelled, against his own natural inclination, and despite his awareness of the fact that he is not professionally qualified for the task, being a herdsman and orchard-worker rather than a prophet, to protest against the evils in his day in the northern kingdom. He has more interest in the nation's history than has Isaiah, but his chief interest is justice and righteousness here and now. Though Amos does not appeal in the name of the tradition, he is the product of that tradition. The conscience and consciousness of God that he shows, the ability to return good for evil, comes from the fact that he is the heir of Moses.

Little that is novel, in the sense of previously unheard of doctrines, can be found in the ideas of Amos and his immediate successors. For J and his sources, quite as much as for Amos, there is a god, Yahweh, who created the whole world. For both other gods may exist, but it is with Yahweh that Israel must reckon. For the early writers, as well as Amos, Yahweh is quite capable of exercising jurisdiction beyond the borders of Israel, and in the lives of foreigners. He is in control of the physical universe and can quite as readily harden the heart of Pharaoh as he can stir up the qualities of leadership latent in Moses. If Amos instituted a new element in Israel's conception of her God it is in the fact that he replaces, not the idea of the election of Israel, but the idea that election means favoritism, with the conviction that election issues in responsibility. Yet, in a real sense, Amos was an innovator. He has the same right to that title as Jesus. The teaching of both men can be paralleled by predecessors and contemporaries. It is selection and emphasis that raise inherited ideas to a new level.

It is often argued that these eighth-century prophets gave impetus to the development of what is called "ethical monotheism." We have already seen that Dr. Albright and his followers put monotheism much earlier than this period. But the "practical monotheism" of early days is in reality monolatry. For the Israel of the early writers Yahweh was the only god to be worshiped and reckoned with. And it also seems apparent that from very early times in Israel religion was considered in relation to ethics. It is the emphasis on social justice that is striking

in Amos, Micah and Isaiah. Not that this is in itself new, we find it in the Covenant Code with its base in the code of Hammurabi. But despite the fact that the tendencies in the direction of ethical monotheism that we find in the eighth century prophets are not a novel thing, these teachers do give the doctrine of One God for Israel, a god who requires loyalty and justice, a fresh emphasis in the manner in which they make their witness and protest. Their originality did not consist so much in the novelty of their ideas as in the selection and development of traditional ideas which they featured. This, in turn, was bound to shape and alter the course of the still developing tradition.

Whether or not these prophets rejected the sacrificial system *per se* and *in toto* is a question still debated and still unsettled.[1] That they relegated them to a subordinate place, so subordinate indeed that nowhere does any one of them utter a command or encouragement to sacrifice, is quite apparent. For all practical purposes the eighth century prophets rejected the sacrificial system. They speak of sacrifice only to criticize; never once do they recommend its continuance in a purified form.

To sum up our argument to this point--in the eighth century there existed a national religious tradition in written or oral form, or both, which we have called pEWs. The shape of this tradition can be discerned from the earlier parts of the Old Testament, the cultural remains of ancient Israel and the few references to it that we have on the pages of the prophets themselves.

---

[1]For an account of a recent contribution to this debate see Appendix B.

We cannot now determine in exactly what literary or oral form the prophets knew this tradition. It would seem that Hosea at least was familiar with a fairly full version of it, and for him the wilderness experience and possibly the covenant (= marriage) was normative for later Israel. Her present unhappy state issued from her apostasy. Her cure was simply to turn back. Hosea is almost a pure traditionalist and where he appears as a critic and dissenter it is as the critic of modern developments in the expression of the tradition, in the spirit of its primitive purity.

Isaiah, Micah, and Amos are also the products of this tradition. But they do not appeal to it as often and as consciously. In the case of Isaiah we cannot even be sure that he knew the exodus story! These prophets are "situational" preachers and their norm is not so much ancient sanctions, but what is presently, immediately and urgently right or wrong. They demand justice. It is true that justice is a concept we see developing from the very beginning, especially in the earlier law codes. The originality of the eighth century prophets is not to be seen in the direction of thinking that they invented the idea of justice or ethical monotheism. It is to be found in their creative personalities and witness and in the way in which they selected, developed and stressed existing concepts and sanctions. The real new ground that they broke in the traditional role of the prophet seems to have been their abandonment of mechanical divination devices, substituting for these observation, reason and inward conviction as the basis of the guidance they sought to give.

The tradition in which these prophets stood was of the

fluid type. As far as I can discover there was no legally and ecclesiastically defined orthodoxy by which they could be judged by their adversaries. The orthodoxy that did condemn them, in so far as they were condemned, was an orthodoxy depending on social consent and social inertia for its force. It is true that there probably was some attempt to regulate conduct (but not, I think, belief) by law. But it is with Deuteronomy that the nation first undertakes to put Torah in a book and make that book law and creed, backed by the power of the state-church and the great name of the nation's founder. Jeremiah is the first prophet, then, who might have been confronted with a solidified type of tradition. We now turn to examine the development and nature of that tradition and, if possible, Jeremiah's attitude to it.

CHAPTER IV

DEUTERONOMY

The Problem of Deuteronomy

The identification of the code found in the temple at the time of Josiah with the book of Deuteronomy goes back to the time of Jerome and Crysostom. Since the publication of DeWette's Dissertatio Critica in 1805 this identification has become the very touchstone of the orthodox critical view of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch.[1] If this identity can be disproved the entire critical structure will have to be drastically modified.

Driver, in his Introduction, gave seven reasons for the acceptance of the dating of Deuteronomy in the seventh century and its identification with the law-book of the temple:

1. Differences between D and Ex. 20-23 show considerable social development.
2. Deut. 17:14,f is reminiscent of Solomon.
3. Forms of idolatry alluded to, especially the worship of the "host of heaven" (4:19; 17:3) point to the middle period of the monarchy.
4. Amos, Hosea and the genuine portions of Isaiah show no trace of Deuteronomy. "Jeremiah exhibits traces of it on nearly every page." Ezekiel and Second Isaiah also influenced. Everything points to a period between Isaiah and Jeremiah.
5. Language of Deuteronomy, "clear and flowing, free from archaisms", would suit the same period as that of Jeremiah.
6. Theological reflection is quite advanced, comparable with Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

---

[1]See opinions of G. F. Moore, W. C. Graham, and A. Menes cited in J. A. Bewer, L. B. Paton and G. Dahl, "The Problem of Deuteronomy, A Symposium," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1928), 360.

7. Comparison of Deut. 16:22 and Is. 19:19 shows that Isaiah could not have known this law.[1]

Paton cites some twenty-six items to show the close correspondence between Deuteronomy and the account of Josiah's reformation in II Kings 22, 23 and goes on to say: "This comparison makes it certain, if we accept the narrative of Kings, that Josiah's book was Deuteronomy."[2] For all orthodox critics the most important of these items is the common insistence of the central sanctuary.

Those who argue for a post-exilic date do not deny this relationship between Deuteronomy and II Kings 22, 23. They contend, however, that Deuteronomy is the deposit, not the program, of the reformation. This position was first taken up by Gramberg in 1829.[3] The chief modern proponents of the post-exilic date are Kennett in Britain, Hölscher in Germany and Berry in America.

Kennett, at the outset of his discussion, asks the question: "Is the law of the one sanctuary as given in Deuteronomy 12, the cause or the ultimate outcome of Josiah's reformation?"[4] He answers, of course, in favour of the second alternative. The similarity between Deuteronomy and the passage in II Kings he attributes to his belief that the account in Kings must have been written at least thirty-five years after the events described by

---

[1]Driver, Introduction, pp. 87 f.

[2]Bewer, Paton, and Dahl, op. cit., p. 326.

[3]Ibid., p. 322.

[4]R. H. Kennett, "The Origin of the Book of Deuteronomy," The Church of Israel, ed. S. A. Cook (Cambridge: The University Press, 1933), p. 74.

a writer of the Deuteronomic school. This account consequently is "coloured by the belief that Josiah as a pious king must have acted in accordance with the Deuteronomic law."[1] He points out that Deuteronomy is addressed to all Israel, whereas Josiah had authority only over Judah. He regards the account in II Kings 23:4b, 15-20, which describes Josiah's desecration of Bethel, as an interpolation.[2] This illustrates the chief weakness of the post-exilic case; it necessitates the free use of the knife to excise all portions that would seem to discredit it. In fact the French school of D'Eichtal, Vernes and L. Horst, to support a post-exilic date for Deuteronomy find it necessary to discount the entire narrative of the reform in II Kings as unhistorical.[3] These critics also have to wield the knife very freely in Jeremiah.

To come back to Kennett, he sees in the law of the kingdom evidence that no king is over Israel, this pointing to a date in the exile.[4] The Josianic reform he represents as a compromise between Jeremiah and the great prophets who repudiated sacrifice and the popular prophets whose ideas are reflected in JE and who desire no change.[5] Josiah's compromise was to insist on the central shrine, thus enabling him to control and eliminate abuses (the most important of which was religious fornication), without having to abolish the institution of sacrifice itself. Jeremiah's angry outburst--"the lying pen of the scribes has wrought false-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 75. [2] Ibid., pp. 76, 77.

[3] Bewer, Paton, and Dahl, op. cit., p. 327.

[4] Kennett, op. cit., p. 77. [5] Ibid., p. 84.

ly"[1]--is not directed at Deuteronomy, but at J whose stories had only recently been collected and were not yet regarded as in any way authoritative. "If J had been generally accepted as canonical for any length of time, Jeremiah's denunciation of sacrifice is inexplicable."[2]

According to Kennett, the legal kernel of Deuteronomy, which was based on the reformation, took shape sometime before the governorship of Zerubbabel.[3] In chapter 27 we find evidence that the law of the central sanctuary was not enforced effectively, at least once, in the authorization of a shrine at Schechem.

The champions of an early date for Deuteronomy are the German, Oestreicher,[4] and the Scotsman, Welch.[5] Oestreicher's contention is that the Josianic reform was not aimed at centralization, but merely at reforming the ritual; he sums it up in his neat phrase "not Kulteinheit but Kultreinheit." The centralization adopted in 621 was a temporary expedient; as soon as conditions would permit the local shrines were to be re-opened. The original Deuteronomy did not demand the central shrine. The crucial verse is 12:14 usually translated: "take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in any place thou seest, but in the place (bammāqōm) which Yahweh shall choose in one of thy tribes (b'ahadh sbbātēkā). Oestreicher renders: "but in any

---

[1]Ibid., p. 84.

[2]Kennett, op. cit., p. 87.

[3]Ibid., p. 91.

[4]The views of Oestreicher, whose book was entitled Das Deuteronomische Grundsetz (1923) are fully set forth in the JBL symposium.

[5]A. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, A New Theory of Its Origin (London: James Clarke Co., Ltd., 1924).

place which Yahweh shall choose in any one of thy tribes."[1]

Welch, apparently working independently of Oestreicher, published his book The Code of Deuteronomy, A New Theory of Its Origin a year later, 1924. His conclusions are about the same. The only passage which demands centralization is 12:1-7. This passage is quite independent of the rest of the code, and

> ". . . in the rest of the code the situation is entirely different. There the centralization of the cult is clearly commanded. The language used to describe the place of worship, to which and which alone Israel is ordered to bring all its offerings, is capable of having this interpretation read out of it or read into it--it does not itself compel this sense."[2]

It is aimed at attaching the people to Yahweh--rather than the Canaanite sanctuaries, that and nothing more. Welch's conclusion, after examining the laws of the code is as follows:

> The Deuteronomic code is the outcome and one expression of that religious and national movement which rose in Benjamin and Ephraim, and which in its beginning is associated with the personality of Samuel. It sprung up after the people had made good their footing in Palestine.[3]

It must be said that in his dealing with the details of the legislation Welch argues very forcefully and brilliantly, showing in each case that it is the Yahweh shrine that Deuteronomy is contending for against the Canaanite shrines, but that it is not necessary to infer that he is insisting on the central shrine. Welch says that many of these laws are impractical if a central shrine is insisted upon.

Twelve is, of course, the crucial chapter. In this chap-

---

[1]Bewer, Paton, and Dahl, op. cit., pp. 306, 307.

[2]Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, p. 195.

[3]Ibid., p. 206.

ter Welch isolates verses one to twelve because they use the second person plural while thirteen to twenty-eight are in the second person singular.[1] Verses thirteen and following say nothing about centralization. The section 1-12 he divides again into two sections (1-7 and 8-12). In Deuteronomy 12:8-12 the situation is one in which the worshippers are exhorted that they must not continue in their present laxity in worship;[2] this reflects a time when Israel's condition was still nomadic and unsettled. We are still left with Deuteronomy 12:1-7 which insists on the destruction of the local shrines; this section must be disposed of if Welch is to establish his position. He does this by calling this passage late. It is late because it assumes the unhistorical attitude of the book of Joshua which pictures a sudden and complete conquest leaving Israel in control of the country. The removal of this section, he argues, would in no way affect the rest of the code.[3] It is interesting to note that while Oestreicher regards the crucial passage as 12:14, which he retranslates, Welch chooses 12:1-7, which he removes as a late interpolation.

We do not have space to examine Welch's detailed discussion of the detailed requirements of the code. The law of the kingdom in chapter seventeen he assigns to the north after the disruption, for the north has good reason to fear a second Solo-

---

[1]Where MT has second plural in vv. 5,9, LXX and Samuel have second singular.

[2]Deut. 12:8.

[3]Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, pp. 57 f.

mon and also the coronation of the half-caste Abimelech.[1] His weakest argument is that it was impractical to require all males to go down to the great feasts of Jerusalem if chapter sixteen presupposes a central shrine.[2] But such sources as Chronicles, the New Testament and Josephus indicate that this was indeed the case in post-exilic times. If it was impossible to conform to this law in 621 B.C., why was it still not so in, say, 300 B.C.?

The case of both schools of thought--those who would date Deuteronomy before 621 B.C. and those who would date it later--is sufficiently strong to throw some doubt on the security of the arguments of the orthodox critical school if the latter cannot bring fresh evidence to bear. W. A. Irwin believes that he has discovered a fresh attack and an objective criterion for the dating of the book at about the time of Josiah.[3]

Irwin finds this objective criterion in the description of the siege of Jerusalem in Deuteronomy 28:45-57. A comparison with Ezekiel 7 and the poems in Lamentations would seem to show that the narrative in Deuteronomy is an account so realistic that the writer must have been an eye-witness. These verses, written soon after 586 B.C. are "a commentary on the epilogue of the Deuteronomic code."[4] This fixes the terminus ante quem as the exile. This, it seems to the present writer, is an argument which the supporters of the Kennett school would have some dif-

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 129 f. [2] Ibid., pp. 62 f.

[3] W. A. Irwin, "An Objective Criterion for the Dating of Deuteronomy," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, LXI (October, 1939).

[4] Ibid., p. 348.

ficulty in overcoming. If verse thirty-six of the same chapter is genuine, Irwin believes that the terminus ad quo is shortly after 745 B.C. But he himself does not admit the authenticity of this verse and contents himself with fixing the terminus ante quem. On the whole, it would seem that the strong arguments of DeWette and his successors have not been overcome and that the Old Testament student can still accept 621 B.C. as the likely date of Deuteronomy. It is accepted by the present writer and will be assumed in the subsequent discussion.

Deuteronomy as a "Hard" Tradition

For the purpose of this discussion we are most interested in Deuteronomy as the first example of a "hard" as over against a "fluid" type of tradition. As Longacre points out:

> Down to that time, and indeed for years afterward, the will of God was sought in the living word of priest and prophet; but with Deuteronomy, for the first time there appeared a document in which the will of God became a written word that remained fixed, not to be altered by later influences.[1]

II Kings 23:3 represents a very important milestone in the history of Israel, Judaism and Christianity. It is the beginning of the "Bible" idea. It is church and state accepting a rule of life as divinely ordered and incorporated in a written document rather than uttered by an inspired speaker. If the Covenant Code or the Decalogue had been previously so adapted we have no clear indication of it.

If we admit that the legal kernel of Deuteronomy is chapters twelve to twenty-six and in substance Josiah's book, we find

---

[1]L. B. Longacre, The Old Testament, Its Form and Purpose (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1945), p. 35.

that our present book is extended at both ends. It is generally agreed that chapters five to eleven are the original introduction to the code. Pfeiffer does not include the first three chapters before an "edition" of about 550 B.C.[1] Driver says of them that they are, at the most, only slightly later than the original Deuteronomy and could easily be by the same hand,[2] Chapter four is generally assumed to be later and Pfeiffer includes it in an "edition" of about 500-450 B.C.[3] By that time the authority of this book was so established that the command not to add nor diminish from it was given (by an "adder"!).[4]

In the introduction proper (chapter 5-11) the command is to adhere strictly to this code, turning "neither to the right nor to the left."[5] That it is <u>this</u> code and none other that is meant is emphasized in the impressive repetition of "them" and "they" referring to "these instructions" in the <u>Shema'</u>.[6] The welfare of the people does not depend on their general piety and sense of justice but upon heeding "these ordinances" and being "careful to observe them."[7] It is not enough to catch the spirit of Deuteronomy--it is "all the charge[8] . . . all the statutes and ordinances I am putting before you this day."[9] The nature of this requirement is clearly seen in the law of the king:

---

[1]Pfeiffer, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 187.

[2]S. R. Driver, <u>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy</u> (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1902), p. lxii.

[3]Pfeiffer, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 187. [4]Deut. 4:2.

[5]Deut. 5:32. [6]Deut. 6:4-9. [7]Deut. 7:12.

[8]Deut. 11:22, 8:1. [9]Deut. 11:32.

> As soon as he has taken his seat on his royal throne, he must write for himself in a book a copy of this code as approved by the Levitical priests; he must keep it with him and peruse it all the days of his life that he may learn to stand in awe of Yahweh his God, by being careful to observe all the provisions of this code and these statutes, that he may not consider himself more exempt than his fellow-countrymen, and that he may not swerve from the charge to the right or to the left in order that he and his descendants may continue long on the throne in Israel.[1]

Thus this book becomes for both king and subject a binding document and sets forth an orthodoxy of thought, and more particularly conduct, by which right thinking and living can be measured. "To the authors it was final, for their purpose infallible, the word of God."[2]

Deuteronomy as a Link between Prophecy and Law

According to Wellhausen "the connecting link between old and new, between Israel and Judaism, is everywhere Deuteronomy."[3] It would be an oversimplification, however, to say that Deuteronomy is simply the crystallization of the spirit of prophecy into rules and regulations. Longacre posits that the original Deuteronomists may have been connected with the faithful disciples of Isaiah mentioned in Isaiah 8:16. He believes the work to have been the coöperative venture of prophets and some priests who were alike horrified at the Assyrian innovations.[4] The book grows from a combination of three elements--the Covenant Code, the four pre-exilic prophets and the peculiar emphases of the Deuteronomists themselves.[5] To it Hosea contributed the idea of love and Amos

---

[1]Deut. 17:18-20. [2]Matthews, op. cit., p. 140.

[3]Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 362.

[4]Longacre, op. cit., p. 17. [5]Ibid., pp. 21-23.

the idea of a reciprocal relationship and obligation.[1] It cannot be denied that in Deuteronomy we do have preserved these prophetic insights, along with a characteristically prophetic concern for social justice and an Isaianic emphasis on faith--a good result will surely accrue from trusting God's workings in history. It is tempting to compare the relationship of prophecy to Deuteronomy with the relationship of the entire Bible tradition with the four ecumenical councils of early Christianity. Bishop Gore summed up the latter development as follows:

> These decisions [i.e. of the ecumenical councils] do, it is contended, simply express in a new form without substantial addition the apostolic teaching as it is represented in the New Testament. They express it in a new form for protective purposes, as a legal enactment protects a moral principle. . . . The decrees are but a hedge, the New Testament is the pasture ground.[2]

Like the conciliar decisions the over-all tone of Deuteronomy is legal rather than prophetic. It is the objective regulation of belief and conduct rather than seeking to purify motives and implant principles that is the main purpose of the code. It would seem that any prophet destined to work in the shadow of such a law would face an additional demand beyond that of his predecessors--the demand that he conform to an accepted orthodoxy or be judged thereby.

Deuteronomy's authority derives from the authority of Moses. The writers go back to the font of Israel's national history and give their sanctions the sanction of the great law giver.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 32.

[2] Quoted in K. Fullerton, Prophecy and Authority (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919), p. 99.

In a manner foreign to their prophetic predecessors they derive their authority, not from a direct apprehension of the word of God, but from the record of what Yahweh said through his servant Moses. The appeal is consciously and purposely to the tradition as that tradition is incarnated in the founder of the nation. For the "thus saith Yahweh" of the prophets the Deuteronomists have put: "These are the decrees, statutes and ordinances which Moses communicated to the Israelites." Thus it is Moses who is the prophet that directly hears the word which civil and religious authorities must administer. Thus the reader and hearer is removed one long step of many centuries from the divine-human encounter and the religion of Deuteronomy must of necessity have been something quite different from the religion of the prophet. Such prophetic insights as it contains are embalmed in a creed and a constitution.

In a real sense Deuteronomy is the first and greatest pseudepigraphon, although it was never entitled simply "Moses" (as far as we know). It is an attempt to sanction religious and moral instruction with the most important figure in the nation's antiquity. With all its genius, the book of Deuteronomy presents to us the first outstanding attempt (in our Hebrew-Christian tradition) to finalize and fossilize religious and moral instruction. Hereafter the prophet must come to terms with the law in a manner much more direct than any of his predecessors were forced to do. Such books as Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi show how complete was his capitulation.

The Covenant in Deuteronomy

It is in Deuteronomy that we first meet the covenant in its unmistakably technical and formal sense. Driver defines covenant as used in Deuteronomy 4:13 as "the most formal and, so to say, official expression of the gracious relationship subsisting between Jehovah and his people Israel."[1] The covenant was an institution well known in the ancient world. International treaties were concluded by this type of compact solemnized by religious ceremonies and sacrificial meals. Between the two portions of a slaughtered and divided animal the contracting parties would pass "invoking upon themselves, in case either should violate the terms of the agreement, a fate similar to that of the slaughtered victim."[2]

Israel came to regard its relationship with Yahweh in these terms. Yahweh, for his part, would guide and bless Israel in return for the latter's fidelity to the covenant terms. In the Old Testament we have references to several covenants (e.g. covenants made with Noah and with Abraham) but the term usually has reference to the events associated with Mt. Sinai.

Deuteronomy's interest in the covenant is concentrated upon Israel's obligation to love and serve Yahweh, and Yahweh only. It is from this source that we have the Jewish creed, the Shema', with its insistence that Yahweh is one, and is to be loved and served with all our faculties.[3] In Deuteronomy 4:23,24,

---

[1]Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 67. [2]Ibid.

[3]Deut. 6:4 f.

17:2 f. and 31:16,20 the covenant is referred to and in each of these cases violation of the covenant is associated with the recognition and service of alien gods. At the time of Josiah it was the worship of the heavenly bodies that seemed to be one of the most tempting forms of apostasy. In Deuteronomy 17:2 it is this particular form of apostasy that is referred to as a covenant violation punishable by death.

There is not so much stress in Deuteronomy on God's side of the covenant, probably because the people were all too aware of this aspect of the relationship while ignoring their own responsibilities in it. We are reminded in 7:9 that Yahweh is "a trustworthy God who to a thousand generations keeps loving faith with those who love him and keep his commandments." It is the Hebrew word ḥesed that is used here and elsewhere in the book to describe God's constancy to his obligations in the covenant relationship. In Deuteronomy 4:31, 7:12 and 8:18 we have references to Yahweh's fidelity to "the covenant which he swore to your fathers."[1] In a very moving passage[2] the writer of a supplement points to the whole history of Israel since the Exodus as evidence of Yahweh's fidelity to his part of the covenant. Thus we see in Deuteronomy the covenant as an agreement to which Yahweh has been as conspicuously faithful as Israel has been false.

Chapters twenty-nine and thirty are supplementary to the Code proper.[3] The writer pictures all Israel as drawn up before

---

[1]In Deut. 7:12 the word "covenant" is not used, but the reference is unmistakable.

[2]Deut. 4:32-40.

[3]Driver, Deuteronomy, p.320.

Yahweh to enter into a solemn compact, essentially a renewal of the Horeb covenant.[1] The people are here warned specifically that this compact does not insure their safety if they persist in rebellion.[2] The writer pictures a time when people will behold the devastation of Israel and ask: "Why has Yahweh done thus to this land?"[3] And the answer will be: "Because they forsook the covenant . . . and went and served alien gods."[4] In this chapter the stress is once more upon Israel's obligation to renounce all gods but Yahweh and serve him alone. In the passage which begins at 30:11 the people are told that it is quite within their power to keep their side of the charge. The issue of "life and prosperity" versus "death and misfortune" is made to hang upon Israel's constancy to the covenant terms.

Thus the religious leaders who came after 621 B.C. were faced with not only a creed and a law, an orthodoxy of thought and action set down in definite terms, but with the Covenant-conception as developed in the book of Deuteronomy.

---

[1]Deut. 29:1.

[2]Deut. 29:19,20.

[3]Deut. 29:24.

[4]Deut. 29:25,26.

CHAPTER V

JEREMIAH

Jeremiah's Witness to the Tradition

As we have seen in the case of his predecessors, it is also true in the case of Jeremiah--there is not a great deal of evidence to establish that he knew very well our documents (or others) which relate the myths, legends, history, poetry or law codes of early Israel. In Jeremiah 4:23 we have a striking passage which seems to recount the creation myth in reverse. The earth becomes chaos, the heavens lose their light, the mountains are no longer "established" and humanity is no more. There is a direct allusion to the creation myth in 10:12, but this passage is suspect.[1] In 23:18 there is an interesting reference to the "council of Yahweh" which may show some acquaintance with the myth behind the first chapter of Job. Sparks seems to see a possible reflection of the flood myth in Jeremiah 31:35.[2] This however, is not too likely and, in any case, the authenticity of this passage is under debate. The reference to Yahweh's "covenant" with the day . . . and with the night" in 33:20,25 may also show some knowledge of the Genesis traditions but, unfortu-

---

[1]Sellin, Introduction, p. 150. See also L. E. Binns, The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah with Introduction and Notes (London: Methuen Co., 1919), p. 75.

[2]Sparks, op. cit., p. 132.

nately, this is also in a highly suspect passage.[1]

There is a slightly more copious collection of references to legendary material. There is a possibility that Jeremiah 1:6 shows some dependence on the call of Moses. The similarity is, however, superficial. Moses pleads his oratorical deficiencies,[2] Jeremiah his inexperience. Jeremiah 8:17 may show knowledge with the wilderness story. Is it possible that the statement in 9:4 "each brother is a sheer supplanter (ʿaqōbh yaʿ qōbh) has the Jacob and Esau story in mind? It just barely could be, but such a term is quite natural in this context without the patriarchal background. In 11:4 and 34:13 are clear references to the exodus saga. In both of these passages the exodus and the covenant are joined together--showing the influence of Deuteronomy. Jeremiah seems to be well acquainted with the Sodom and Gomorrah legend.[3] If we accept the "new covenant" passage we also have a reference to the exodus story in 31:32. Jeremiah 34:13 shows the prophet's knowledge of the slavery laws of the Covenant Code.[4]

In the story of Jeremiah's purchase of the family inheritance (a Baruch passage) we find the best evidence of his knowledge of the legendary history of early Israel. Jeremiah 32:20-22 shows a rather full knowledge of the exodus-wilderness-settlement segment of the tradition. Unless we accept the suggestion noted above in regard to 9:4, there is no reference to Jeremiah to the patriarchal period. There are some passages which indicate his

---

[1]Sellin, Introduction, p. 150.

[2]Exod. 4:10.

[3]Jer. 20:16, 23:14, 49:18(?).

[4]Exod. 21:2 (E).

knowledge of the later history. In the temple address[1] the prophet uses the fate of the Shiloh sanctuary as a warning and in 15:1 he speaks of Samuel in connection with Moses. Sparks would see a reference to the period of the judges in 31:4;[2] this, however, is not very evident. The authenticity of 33:17 is questioned with good reason.[3] In 2:2,6-7 the wilderness and conquest is referred to.

It is thus safe though to assume that Jeremiah knew the myths, legends and history of Israel to some extent, though there is a strange hiatus for the patriarchal period. Jeremiah, despite his conservatism, does not fill his oracles with historical allusions.

Jeremiah's Witness to His Prophetic Predecessors

It can hardly be doubted that Jeremiah had before him, in some form or other, the words of Hosea. The parallels are not only in spirit, and to the use of similar metaphors, but they sometimes extend to the very words themselves.[4] In Binns' list of parallel passages the most striking examples of near verbal identity are: Jeremiah 4:3 cf. Hosea 10:12; Jer. 9:12 cf. Hos. 14:9 and Jer. 13:10 cf. Hos. 9:9. From Hosea Jeremiah apparently got his idealization of the wilderness period, his idea of sin as apostasy pictured as adultery and fornication and his marriage metaphor.

---

[1]Jer. 7:12, 26:6,9. [2]Sparks, op. cit., p. 135.

[3]Sellin, Introduction, p. 150.

[4]A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Doctrine of the Prophets (2d ed.; London: Macmillan Co., 1907), p. 117; also

In 26:18 Micah 3:12 is quoted and Jeremiah reveals some similarity to Micah in his picture of the fall of Jerusalem. Peculiar to Amos and Jeremiah are the expressions "virgin of Israel" and "days are coming." There is little or no echo of Isaiah in Jeremiah.[1] The social teaching of Jeremiah stands in the tradition of CC, the eighth century prophets and Deuteronomy--in all of these sources there is similar concern for weaker members of the community and denunciation of exploitation and luxury.

Jeremiah's Witness to Deuteronomy

In view of the sweeping nature of Josiah's reform one would expect abundant reference to Deuteronomy in Jeremiah. Though the deuteronomic shadow falls across Jeremiah's pages in that they show stylistic evidence of deuteronomic revision, there are actually no clear and uncontested references to Deuteronomy itself in Jeremiah. Commentators assess the prophet's attitude to Deuteronomy on the basis of two passages--11:1-8 and 8:8. It cannot be proved that either of these demand such a reference. It seems best to leave detailed consideration of these important passages to the place where we must come to grips with the question of Jeremiah's acceptance or rejection of the reform. But here let us take note that the surprising thing in Jeremiah's early oracles is their lack of clear and abundant reference to the reform movement.

Jeremiah's Appeal to the Tradition

Thus says Yahweh:

---

[1]Binns, op. cit., p. lxx.

Stand by the ways, and look
And ask for the ancient paths,
Where the good way is, and walk in it
And find rest for yourselves.
But they said, "We will not walk in it."[1]

The question here is what Jeremiah meant by "the ancient paths where the good way is." Is this a generalized appeal to the "good old days" or did the prophet have some particular experience of the nation in mind? There is a possibility that he located "the good way" in the work of the eighth century prophets. About a full century elapsed between Jeremiah and Amos and Hosea and the period of these men could possibly be called "ancient." The prophet here does not necessarily idealize the past, but locates "the good way" among other "ancient paths." This presents the attractive possibility of Jeremiah standing in the tradition of "our" prophets and seeing their witness as a good way among other ancient paths. This interpretation of the passage is accepted by I. G. Matthews.[2]

But we must keep in mind Jeremiah's other oracles and in view of them there can be little doubt that for him, like Hosea, the "good way" is to be found in the wilderness period:

Thus says Yahweh
I recall your youthful devotion
your bridal love,
How you followed me through the desert
through a land unsown.
Israel was sacred to Yahweh
his firstfruits of harvest.[3]

---

[1]Jer. 6:16.

[2]Matthews, op. cit., p. 149. "These paths, as the whole context shows, were to be found in the teaching of the writing prophets, whose ethical ideals the youth had absorbed being aflame with their self-evident and vital teachings."

[3]Jer. 2:2-3a.

Throughout the early chapter of this prophecy the picture in this respect is clear. Yahweh and Israel were once "lovers." But Israel "forsook" Yahweh to go after other lovers. Sin is thus apostasy or backsliding. And the call is to "return" (shūb).[1] This is exactly the same framework and mood that we find in Hosea, expressed in the same metaphor and type of phraseology. It shows Jeremiah to have been motivated by the same conservative spirit as his teacher, calling judgment down on his day in the name of a primitive purity. A "yoke" has been broken, "bonds" have been snapped, a time of fearful freedom has come.

Jeremiah's Alleged Acceptance of Deuteronomy

We now come to the very thorny problem of Jeremiah's relationship to Deuteronomy. This problem is made difficult by the scarcity of the material. As Skinner says: "explicit and unmistakable allusions to Deuteronomy are fewer than we should have anticipated on any view of Jeremiah's judgment on its merits."[2] The usual explanation is that as an enthusiastic youth Jeremiah eagerly accepted the reform, but added years of bitter experience and opportunities for observation made him increasingly critical and hostile to it. The notion that Jeremiah originally assisted in the reform is based largely on the passage 11:1-8.

J. P. Hyatt has given us a very careful study of this passage.[3] The parallels which he cites[4] makes it abundantly clear

---

[1]Jer. 3:12, 3:14, 4:1, etc.

[2]Skinner, op. cit., p. 115.

[3]J. P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. I (April, 1942).

[4]Ibid., p. 169.

that, if we accept the passage as it stands, there is no doubt that the purpose of Jeremiah's preaching mission "to the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" was the propagation of the deuteronomic legislation. Hyatt rejects the passage as a later deuteronomic attempt to make Jeremiah one of the reformers, which he never was.

There is no doubt that the deuteronomists have tampered with this passage. It is not necessary, however, to deny the authenticity of the entire oracle. If we excise the obvious deuteronomisms we do have the basis for an oracle thoroughly in harmony with Jeremiah's spirit and viewpoint elsewhere revealed:

> Thus says Yahweh, the God of Israel:
> "Listen to my voice, and do just as I command you!"
> Then Yahweh said to me:
> "Proclaim all these words in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem, saying, 'I earnestly appealed to your fathers on the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, and have appealed to them, early and late, even to this day, saying, "Listen to my voice." Yet they neither listened, nor inclined their ears, but followed each the stubborn promptings of his own evil mind.'"

This leaves Jeremiah appealing, not to a covenant renewal in the land of Moab, but to the day of deliverance, to which he also appeals in 7:22. It seems to the present writer that the modification of this passage on the basis of an assumption of deuteronomic tampering, or the complete rejection of it (as Hyatt urges), does much to make more comprehensible the early chapters of Jeremiah and the personality of the prophet. He, on this view, never appeals to Deuteronomy, but back of it to the supposedly good days subsequent to Sinai.

It is sometimes argued that the hostility of Jeremiah's priestly relatives in Anathoth must have issued from his espousal

of the reforming party's cause. It is true that should the reform have succeeded completely it would have meant the end of the local shrines, including that of Anathoth. But, surely, Jeremiah's general attitude and fundamental criticism of priest and cultus would be sufficient to account for such hostility.

Against the viewpoint here expressed may perhaps be put Jeremiah's oracle is praise of Josiah:

> Did not your father, as he ate and drank,
> Do justice and righteousness?
> Then all went well with him.
> He defended the cause of the poor and needy;
> Then all went well.
> Is that not to know me?
> Is the oracle of Yahweh.[1]

But here the prophet is only concerned with Josiah's social ethics. In this realm there is general agreement from the Covenant Code through the prophets and Deuteronomy to Jeremiah. Nothing is said here about Josiah's sweeping religious reformation.

The assumption that Jeremiah was an early supporter of the reforming party, and only later withdrew from it, is based on a rather shaky foundation in fact. It is actually based on one passage which may well be spurious and, if not so, is obviously edited. For Jeremiah it is the wilderness period (known to him in some form without the golden calf story) that is normative. He judges the nation, not by Deuteronomy, which he all but ignores (except where he criticizes it), but by a much more ancient tradition.

There is, however, some affinity. For Deuteronomy and Jeremiah the motive of a proper relationship to Yahweh is love.

---

[1]Jer. 22:15b,16.

The people of God are joined to their God in a covenant relationship, likened to marriage by Hosea and Jeremiah. For all three, too, sin is apostasy, falling away. Neither Hosea nor Jeremiah, however, sought to get the covenant down to precise legal terms. When Deuteronomy did just that Jeremiah found himself in opposition to some of its most important requirements. The covenant idea of Deuteronomy is quite in accord with Jeremiah's attitude. But with the deuteronomic attempt to set down specifically, in terms of legal requirements, what this involved, Jeremiah shows scant, if any, sympathy.

The Mood of Dissent in Jeremiah

Jeremiah's opposition to Deuteronomy.--On the idea of the central shrine Jeremiah does not seem to comment. But much of his polemic is directed squarely at temple[1] and city.[2] The refrain

The temple of Yahweh,
The temple of Yahweh,
The temple of Yahweh,

consists of "deceptive words" when the conduct of the people is not in accord with their professed piety. As Skinner says:

> These two types of mind confront each other in Jeremiah and the better representatives of the Deuteronomic point of view. To the latter it would seem a hopeful thing that the Temple court was thronged day by day with reverent worshippers, even if their lives fell short of their profession. To Jeremiah it was simply a profanation of the holiness of God and the most hopeless spectacle that the mind can contemplate.[3]

Both Jeremiah and Deuteronomy opposed the foreign astral

---

[1]Jer. 7 and 26.

[2]Jer. 26:11, 5:1 f.

[3]Skinner, op. cit., p. 176.

cults. But Jeremiah also opposed the domestic cult and like Amos and Isaiah denied its very validity. The words are so unambiguous that it is strange and wonderful that so many interpreters can cavil at their clear import:

> For in the day that I brought your fathers out of the land of Egypt, I did not speak to them, nor give them command regarding burnt-offering or sacrifice.[1]

Skinner, once more, makes clear (though what could be clearer?) what is said here:

> The error here rebuked is not simply the practical abuse of sacrificial ritual by men who sought thus to compound for their moral delinquencies; it is the notion that Yahweh had ever instituted sacrifice at all.[2]

Here is the crux of Jeremiah's controversy with Deuteronomy.

Jeremiah 8:8 is supposed by many to contain a direct reference to Deuteronomy. This is quite possible, but it could also refer to the J document or to general scribal activity. That is, there is nothing to compel one to see a reference to Deuteronomy here, though if it does contain such the attitude of the prophet in this verse is thoroughly in accord with the position here adopted. Welch sees in 3:6-13 another critical reference to the reformation.[3] That this might be so is indicated in verse ten: "Judah did not return to me in sincerity, but in sheer hypocrisy." After the fall of the north, revival was to be expected in Judah. But the only revival is hypocritical.

---

[1]Jer. 7:22.

[2]Skinner, op. cit., p. 182. See also footnote on p. 181: "Not only is sacrifice of no avail as a substitute for righteous conduct, but a perfect religious relationship is possible without sacrifice at all . . . [the prophets] never demand a purified ritual."

[3]A. C. Welch, Jeremiah, His Time and Work (Oxford: The University Press, 1928), pp. 77 f.

The total impact of the evidence is that Jeremiah opposed the deuteronomists. If he did support them it was briefly and in his youth. Even that is not a thesis easily sustained.

Prophet, priest and king.--Jeremiah sees the prophets and priests of his day as superficial healers of the nation's wound:

> The wound of the daughter of my people
> They lightly heal,
> Saying, "All is well, all is well",
> When nought is well.[1]

Their remedy is to deny the seriousness of the wound. It is but a palliative, deserving the epithet: "falsehood." He denies the divine authority of the prophets and predicts for them all the horrors of the coming siege.[2] He sees these religious leaders stealing one another's oracles, intent only on personal gain and prestige.[3] He sets himself resolutely against the dream method of divination over against which he puts the possession of the word of Yahweh.[4]

Unlike his teacher Hosea, Jeremiah does not seem to question the institution of the monarchy per se. He praises Josiah for his social justice[5] but comes into conflict with his successors. With Jehoiakim he is often in conflict--denouncing him for his luxury and injustice[6]--confronting him in the famous "burning of the scroll" meeting[7]--predicting for him "the burial of an ass,"[8] and no successors on the throne of David.[9] Zedekiah he tries, in vain, to keep to a sane pro-Babylonian policy.[10]

---

[1]Jer. 8:11. [2]Jer. 7:14-18. [3]Jer. 23:30.
[4]Jer. 23:25-28. [5]Jer. 22:15 f. [6]Jer. 22:11 f.
[7]Jer. 36. [8]Jer. 22:19. [9]Jer. 28:3c.
[10]Jer. 34:1-7, 37:1-10, 38:14-28a.

Jeremiah in the last days of Judah becomes, in the eyes of his countrymen, a traitor, predicting for them no good save as they surrender to the enemy. For him nation as nation is finally repudiated by Yahweh, because of its stubborn refusal to repent. In Jeremiah we see the logical outcome of Amos's famous repudiation of the idea of divine election as divine assurance: ". . . the divine righteousness and holiness are independent of any earthly attachment and must assert themselves in the destruction of that which they once chose and loved."[1]

Thus the mood of dissent and rebellion seems to go to the limit in this prophet. He set his face as flint against the spirit and temper of his times--its worship, its political and military policies, its religious leaders, its kings and princes, its very reforms. To his contemporaries he must have appeared as an uncompromising radical. Yet "Jeremiah . . . was in reality a conservative; his great objective was to bring back the purer conditions of that past upon which his heart so frequently meditated."[2] In his teaching he called for no new thing but "the ancient path where the good way is."

Jeremiah as An Individualist

In the "Confessions" we have a new type of religious literature and an insight into the prophetic consciousness. These very human documents[3] reveal the inner relationship of a very

---

[1]E. L. Allen, Prophet and Nation, A Reconciliation of Divided Loyalties (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1947), p. 89.

[2]Binns, op. cit., p. xxxvi.

[3]For a list of the "confession" passages see Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 503.

sensitive man and his God. They also show that for him the word of Yahweh is not to be found in mechanical divination devices but within himself. He speaks because he cannot be silent, and the pressure is from within. This pressure he identifies with the word of Yahweh. It will not allow him to be silent, even when self-regard dictates that he should remain so:

> For the word of Yahweh has become to me,
> A reproach and a derision all day long,
> If I say, "I will not think of it,
> Nor speak any more in his name,
> It is in my heart like a burning fire,
> Shut up in my bones;
> I am worn out with holding it in--
> I cannot endure it.[1]

In the famous "new covenant" passage,[2] if it be authentic,[3] we have another very significant contribution to an emphasis on personal religion that will be continued by some of the Psalmists. The present writer is inclined to accept the authenticity of this passage because he can find no better place for it than here. It is certainly not typical of later Judaism. It is by no means untypical of the teaching and personality of Jeremiah as revealed in his personal history and authentic oracles.

Jeremiah stands in the conservative tradition of Hosea and his nomadic predecessors. His function is to call men "back." Yet in his emphasis on personal religion fresh ground is gained. He is the first Old Testament personality whose inner life is fully and authentically revealed to us. And that revelation points toward the day when men shall know Yahweh because his covenant is written, not on statutes, but in the heart.

---

[1] Jer. 20:8b-9.

[2] Jer. 31:31-34. [3] Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 517, accepts it.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Writing in 1919, J.M.P. Smith discussed "The Conservatism of Early Prophecy."[1] By "early prophecy" he had in mind, mainly, the work of Elijah and Elisha. His conclusion was that these prophets were simply and fanatically nomadic opponents of civilization.[2] Their policies failed. This was a fortunate failure for had they succeeded the Hebrew nation and the worship of Yahweh (to which they were devoted) might never have persevered.[3] Smith concluded his article by raising the following question:

> This discussion has thus far covered but one stage of a larger subject. I may only suggest its nature now. The policy of hostility to civilization did not win. Was this failure in spite of the best efforts of the later prophets from Amos on to champion it and carry it through to triumphant dominance? If so, what influences of a contrary sort came in of such powerful character as to render the efforts of the prophets futile? Of did Amos and his successors represent a radical change in this respect in that they abandoned the policy of opposition to culture and set themselves deliberately to the task of making Yahweh, the desert God, recognized as the lord of all the ways of civilized man? Are those scholars therefore to be acknowledged who speak of Amos as "the founder of a new phases of prophecy," or "the pioneer of a process of evolution from which a new epoch of humanity dates," or "the beginner of the new prophecy"? Whatever may be the answer to these questions, we are left with a further problem, viz., what new influences operated, either in cooperation with prophecy or in opposition thereto, to bring about in Israel, in and after the eighth century B.C., a broadening of the conception of Yahweh, and a thoroughgoing

---

[1] J.M.P. Smith, "The Conservatism of Early Prophecy," The American Journal of Theology, Vol. XXIII, No. 3 (July, 1919).

[2] Ibid., pp. 297, 298. [3] Ibid., p. 298.

> moralization of the Yahweh religion? What candidates are there in the field for this honor? Is it to be assigned to the credit of the Assyrian Armies, or to a powerful stream of Egyptian cultural influence that may have made itself felt at this time, or to the unassisted growth of the native Hebrew spirit? The discussion of these questions must be deferred?[1]

Were Amos and his successors founders of a new phase of prophecy or were they conservatives in the tradition of Elijah and Elisha? This is the question we have sought to explore in the foregoing pages. Conservatives, as a rule, tend to find conservatism in the prophets. Radicals would have them to be likewise radical. The author of a recent very radical book has this to say of the prophets:

> Some prophets go so far as to declare outward forms of religion useless and even criminal. The prophets, and Jesus too, are definitely anti-religious in the sense we give to that word. Unlike other reformers they do not seek to restore the past, but they demand a radical transformation of life and religion. They turn their eyes from the golden age which lies in the past, and, by a truly revolutionary coup de force orient the peoples' dreams, aspirations and hopes toward the future. They speak of a coming Day of Yahweh of a new covenant, a rededication, of a new alliance of which the conditions shall not be written in a book, but in everyone's heart, when external authority shall be replaced by inner autonomy. It is the religion of the spirit that comes into being in the prophets' progressive revelation of Yahveh.[2]

Our study thus far should at least show us how superficial such a generalization is. Sound exegesis requires that we forget our own conservatism or radicalism, so far as that is possible, and seek to understand what each prophet meant his hearers to understand by his words. This we have tried to do. We shall now try to summarize our findings.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 298, 299.

[2] P. Van Paasen, Why Jesus Died (New York: Dial Press Inc., 1949), p. 66.

Common Traditional Elements

Their status in the tradition.--These five prophets had at least one thing in common--all were children of Israel and consequently the products of the social and religious history of the same nation. Provided for them was a country, a language, a social order with its officials, a national history expressed in sagas and songs, forms of worship, cultic functionaries and a national deity. They were all Israelites, and the term involves a faith as well as a nationality. Their situation in this respect might be likened to that of a modern boy born in a religiously homogeneous nation like, say, Spain. Their nation provided them with a religion. But for the ancient Hebrew prophets the tradition was still in a fluid state (in the case of the eighth century prophets) and its acceptance was determined by social consent rather than law or creed.

Their acceptance of pEWs.--Though the eighth century prophets had no Bible, they and Jeremiah (who apparently had the first Bible) had, in some form, probably oral and written, the great story of the nation with its patriarchal beginning, its dramatic captivity-exodus experience, its wilderness sojourn, its settlement as a nation in the promised land. In the case of Amos, Hosea and Jeremiah, and the deuteronomists, we have evidence of a fairly complete knowledge of this tradition. In Isaiah we can probably assume some knowledge of it, though the citable evidence here, it must be admitted, is practically nonexistent.

The exodus experience does not seem to have the fascina-

tion for these prophets that it had for the deuteronomists. For the more historically minded of them--Hosea and Jeremiah--it is, strangely enough, not the exodus, but the wilderness sojourn that holds their attention. Isaiah does not seem to refer to the exodus at all and Amos compares it to Syrian and Philistine migrations.[1] It is Deuteronomy, not the prophets, which makes the exodus and the subsequent covenant normative for later Israel.

Their social ethics.--The social ethics of the pre-exilic prophets and Jeremiah, as we have seen, are no new thing in conception, only in emphasis. There is a consistent tradition in this respect from the Covenant Code, through the prophets and Deuteronomy, to Judaism.

Their monolatrous theology.--For all five prophets Yahweh is the only God with whom Israel has to reckon. We can agree with Albright in contending that they were "practical monotheists." In Amos and Isaiah particularly it is clearly stated that Yahweh has to do with foreign nations, and they with him.

The present writer, however, prefers for their theological label the term "monolatry," leaving Deutero-Isaiah as the first real monotheist. In their monolatry our prophets stood in an older tradition. For J Yahweh is the creator of the world and the confounder of the nations. In dealing with the international situation of their day the prophets we have surveyed--especially Amos and Isaiah--extended the development of theology and prepared the way for the real monotheism of Deutero-Isaiah and Judaism.

---

[1] Amos 9:7.

Traditional Elements Not Common

The conservatism of Hosea and Jeremiah.--Although we perhaps see some hint of it in Amos 2:10 and Isaiah 1:21-31, there is a conservative element in the thought of Hosea and Jeremiah not so prevalent in that of the others. The dissent of these two is definitely dissent in the name of primitive purity. In Hosea there is a call back to wilderness religious conditions. Jeremiah also idealizes this period, though he is too much of a civilized teacher to think that the clock can be turned back. In their common idealization of the particular part of the past, however, both prophets might be termed "traditionalist."

Amos's and Hosea's acceptance of the office of prophet.--In Amos[1] and Hosea[2] we have definite statements which indicate that they do not repudiate the office of prophet (and presumably priest) although they are, of course, very critical of those professional religious leaders with whom they come into contact.

The prophetic acceptance of the monarchy.--All of these prophets, with the likely exception of Hosea, accept the institution of the monarchy, though they are all very critical of most of the contemporary kings, whom they regard as misguided, if not apostate.

Common Dissenting Attitudes

Opposition to the spirit of their times.--All five prophets in our survey would have been regarded by their contemporaries as radicals, and possibly the two most conservative--Hosea and

---

[1]Amos 2:12, 3:7. [2]Hos. 12:10,13.

Jeremiah--as most radical of all. They stood in opposition to the spirit of their times: its religion, its worship, its civil and religious leaders, its institutions, its eschatological hopes.

Their opposition to the sacrificial system.--We have maintained throughout this study that these prophets, as far as we can tell, opposed the domestic cultus in its sacrificial expression. Whenever they speak of sacrifice it is to criticize it. Not once do they recommend a purified sacrificial system.

Their criticism of the depositaries.--Prophet, priest and king, as they presently function, come in for fierce opposition from these prophets. These officials are the keepers of the "deposit." In the eyes of these prophets they have forfeited their trust.

"Prophets of doom."--The present writer concurs in Mowinckel's judgment: "Even a superficial study of the prophetic books in the light of history shows that the prophets whose remains we have, even to the time of Jeremiah, were predominantly 'doom prophets.'"[1] For each of them the present order was hastening to its end. It is Isaiah who sees most clearly beyond the present impending chaos to the prospect of a purified restoration, but Jeremiah, too, is not without this faith.

Dissenting Attitudes Not Common

Amos's clear transformation of the doctrine of election.--In the famous passage 3:1,2 Amos transforms the conception "elec-

---

[1]S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition (Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1946), p. 86.

tion means protection and favoritism" to "election means responsibility." The others share in this view, but none state it so clearly.

Hosea's opposition to the monarchy.--It has been our contention that Hosea opposed the institution of the monarchy *per se* and dated the beginning of the nation's decline and fall to its adoption of this symbol of civilization and paganism.

Isaiah's and Jeremiah's attitude to foreign policy.--Both Isaiah and Jeremiah contended against the popular foreign policy of their day. They emerge as perhaps the first articulate critics of foreign policy in Israel's history. Isaiah supported a pro-Assyrian, Jeremiah a pro-Chaldaean policy. Both opposed the Egyptian alliance.

Jeremiah's implicit opposition to Deuteronomy.--The problem of Jeremiah's attitude to Deuteronomy is not, as we have seen, an easy one to solve, due to the puzzling paucity of relevant material. But, whatever his early attitude, it is clear enough that in his later career he opposed much of what is important in this code--especially the sacrificial system. This is the first instance of a prophet's rejection of a "hard" tradition.

Jeremiah's "treason."--In counselling desertion to the Chaldaean enemy, the mood of dissent reached its ultimate of what would today be called treason in Jeremiah.

Jeremiah's individualism.--While all five prophets could well be called individualists, the idea of personal responsibility and piety becomes most clear in Jeremiah's "confessions" and his "new covenant" conception.

Two Traditions within the Prophecy under Review

It is the contention of the present writer that it may be possible to discern two separate traditions within the prophecy which we have studied. Hosea and Jeremiah, despite their bitter criticism of the contemporary depositaries, continued the conservative tradition of Elijah and Elisha described by J.M.P. Smith. Like Elijah and Elisha Hosea called for a "return" to the supposed "good old days" of the wilderness period and Jeremiah idealized the period. In their view, the sin of Israel is apostasy, unfaithfulness. This conservative mood is continued in such Judaistic documents as Deuteronomy, Haggai, Malachi--though in a somewhat different form. For these later documents, conservative though they be, do not contain the nostalgia of the earlier conservative prophets.

A new prophetic tradition emerges in Amos, perhaps Micah, and supremely Isaiah. Here we have little interest in ancient history. While Amos may be the "beginner of the new prophecy" it reaches its fullest form in Isaiah. Even shorn as he is by modern criticism of his messianic and "evangelical" glory, Isaiah is still, in a real sense, the greatest of the prophets. For Isaiah seems to accept the idea of civilization. He engages in a constructive way in current affairs. He wears lightly the achievements and insights of the tradition and does not dote on them. Rather he turns all the force of his mind and personality on an effort to save the present situation.

In the face of his conviction that immediate doom is un-

avoidable, Isaiah works out a view of the future that sees a real restoration. In part Jeremiah, who purchased the family inheritance and possibly looked to an end of the exile, followed Isaiah here. But Isaiah with his doctrines of faith, the remnant and the restoration, is the real pioneer of hope. His career, it seems to me, is a real break in the conservative, nomadic, prophetic tradition. Whether credit for this break is to be assigned to the Assyrian armies, Egyptian cultural influences, influences at work in Israel or to something distinctly creative in the life and mind of Isaiah himself, we do not presume to say. But the present study has led the writer to the conclusion that in Amos, perhaps Micah and supremely Isaiah we have a new dissenting prophetic tradition that constitutes a break from the conservative line from Elijah and Elisha, through Hosea and Jeremiah, to Judaism. Further research might well disclose that this Isaianic stream of tradition reappears in such books as Ruth and Jonah and possibly reaches its climax in the career and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.

The Role of Tradition and Dissent in Creative Religious Thinking

This study should be sufficient to show that both traditional and dissenting attitudes have their place in creative religious leadership, and that they can be effectively combined in the work of a single leader. No one can afford to ignore the past. All of us are in part made by the tradition in which we stand. There are times when it is the duty of religious leaders to call their contemporaries "back" to the "good way" of an "an-

cient path." But even those prophets whom we have labelled "traditionalist" are never interested in creedal or legal conformity. Jeremiah, traditionalist though he was, saw little or no hope in the deuteronomic attempt to regulate faith and action along traditional lines.

There are two types of dissent in the prophets whose work we have reviewed. All of them were dissenters in that they set themselves in opposition to the mood and the institutions of their day. Amos, and especially Isaiah are, in my view, dissenters also in that they broke from the prophetic tradition itself--the tradition that made nomadism the norm. Isaiah tried to ascertain the divine will for the present situation, untrammeled by nostalgia for a past that could not be recalled.

Thus Isaiah became the greatest of the prophets. Consciously or unconsciously, he came to the realization that it is futility to try simply to turn back the clock. Nomadic conditions were not going to return. Nostalgia for them would be so much wasted emotion. What we must do is to discern the divine will for the situation in which we find ourselves. In any case it is probably that Hosea and Jeremiah were mistaken in their supposition that the wilderness period was a golden age of piety and purity. For the sources we have at our disposal by no means paint such a picture. Why cry for Moses when the Jothams, the Ahazs, the Hezekiahs of our own day are trying to keep the ship afloat. Is it not our job to use all our resources of knowledge, including knowledge of the tradition, and inspiration at our disposal for finding the divine will for them that they might be both reproved and encouraged?

The Modern Religious Leaders and These Prophets

The modern Protestant preacher and pastor often likes to compare himself with the Old Testament prophets. We read sometimes of the "prophetic tradition" of the ministry of some "dissenting" denomination as over against the "priestly tradition" of the ministry of a body of a more Catholic type. Yet it is difficult to see a parallel between the modern Protestant religious leader, liberal or conservative, and the prophets included in our survey. Rather it is the cultic prophets and the priests, against whom "our" prophets find themselves in constant opposition, who are the leaders of the Church. It is their responsibility to keep the institution going. It is by a strange twist of fate that the laymen who opposed them were to become for later generations the "canonical" prophets!

It is difficult to see how the prophetic voice in our own day can come from professional religious leaders. Burdened as they are with the care of an institution--and that task is most essential--they become singularly unfitted by temperament and personal interest to be the critics of their day. At present, or so it seems to the present writer, the voice of prophecy is being sounded by the atomic physicists and their allies--these are the new prophets of doom. It remains to be seen whether or not the rest of us will listen to the word of God as they speak it or whether we will let future generations, if there be any such, canonize and immortalize those whom the present-day depositaries will neither heed nor hear. Those who speak against destruction speak in the spirit of the tradition in which we all stand, which

early stated that our world and its creatures are divinely made and that the divine architect and builder found them "very good."[1]

It was a prophet who did his work in the era lying just beyond our survey who emphasized that we must both pay heed to our past and pay attention to the creative work of God that is still going on:

> Look to the rock from which you were hewn,
> And the quarry from which you were dug;
> Look to Abraham your father,
> And to Sarah who bore you![2]
>
> The former things, lo! they have come to pass,
> And new things I foretell;
> Before they spring into being,
> I announce them to you.[3]
>
> Remember not former things,
> Nor pay heed to things long past.
> Behold, I am doing a new thing,
> Even now it is springing to light--
> Do you not perceive it?[4]

---

[1] Gen. 1:31.

[2] Isa. 51:1b,2a.

[3] Isa. 42:9.

[4] Isa. 43:18,19a.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MOWINCKEL'S PROPHECY AND TRADITION

Sigmund Mowinckel's interesting paper appeared in its English translation and became available to the present writer only after this dissertation had been conceived, planned and partially executed. It deals, however, with quite a different problem. Mowinckel is concerned, not with the prophets' relation to earlier traditions, but with the origin and development of the prophetic tradition itself. It is an essay in tradition-criticism.[1] The growth of the prophetic tradition was, of course, subject to many of the same laws and patterns as the growth of the earlier traditions and Mowinckel's study throws light on the whole problem of the origin, growth, form, function and final pattern of what came to be the Old Testament.

Mowinckel does not contend that the traditio-historical method, which he expounds, is an alternative to literary criticism. It is not a case of "either-or" but of "both-and." He does, however, seem to feel that the literary division and subdivision of sources and subsources has quite spent itself and that at this time more fruitful results can be expected from his

---

[1]The complete title, with sub-title, shows quite clearly the writer's purpose: S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition--The Prophetic Books in the Light of the Study of the Growth and History of the Tradition (Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1946).

own type of method[1] which seems to be analogous to the New Testament formgeschichte.

This writer states his own conclusion very clearly:

> The result with which we shall have to rest satisfied, is that the relatively brief, in itself, complete and concluded independent separate saying ("oracle") is the original and real form of prophet "speech", his message, and that this is also largely the case with the historically known prophets, "the scripture prophets" as they are generally, and misleadingly, termed. These separate sayings have been transmitted by oral traditions in the prophet oracles, partly unchanged, partly adapted to and revived in the new situations of new times; they have been living a life in tradition and have been serving a religious purpose within the circle; the tradition has not been static.
>
> In the course of the history of the tradition there have arisen greater "tradition complexes" and collections out of these separate sayings which again, in their turn have been joined together to final collections of tradition. The latter may also have been handed down by word of mouth.
>
> Finally, however, they have been recorded; they have become "books." This written fixing may have been started earlier, with the separate minor "complexes", and the oral tradition may have continued side by side with the written one.[2]

For Mowinckel the "fixed starting point" is in the "prophet narratives" where the content of the oracle is delimited by the narrative in which it stands.[3] These oracles we find in the prophetic books and in the Psalms, but perhaps the best examples are in the historical books. "We meet here the separate, self-contained prophetic messages."[4] He finds that these are characterized by:

1. Brevity: with the exception of II Kings 19:21b-28 (= Isaiah 37:22b-29), the four Balaam lays and Psalms 81:7-17; 89: 20-38, 132:11-18 these oracles are very brief.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

[2] Ibid., p. 60.

[3] Ibid., p. 45.

[4] Ibid., p. 45.

[5] Ibid., pp. 45, 46. Examples of very brief oracles, some consisting of a single word: I Sam. 10:1b, 23:2b; II Sam. 2:1; II Kings 1:3,4; 16; 3:16-19a.

2. Their introduction consists of some such formula as "Thus Yahweh hath said" and sometimes "Say to . . ."[1]

3. As to content, there are two types:

(a) The simpler one contains only the message, either a prediction[2] or an instruction, command or task.[3]

(b) The more complicated type contains the motivation as well as the prediction.[4] This basic is sometimes embellished and may contain "punishment speech," anticipated lamentation on the disaster, beatification, etc.[5]

> We see already, from this material, that it is the separate "message", determined by the situation, which is the typical prophet-saying. It has always been a rounded, complete statement, introduced, sometimes also concluded, by type-determined formulae, even if variable within the basic type, and with fixed elements of content in a traditional style.[6]

The next stage in development is the "tradition complex," formed by connecting the basic elements (pericopes) by adding small connectives and stereotyped formulae.[7] Such blocks of scripture as the following are tradition complexes: Isaiah 1:2-31; Isaiah 6:-9:6; Micah 1-5; Micah 6,7 and the books of Amos and Hosea in their entirety.

This brings us to the exegetical problem of context in interpretation. Mowinckel shows us how useless is our familiar chaptering for this task.[8] We must work with the single oracle

---

[1] Ibid., p. 46.
[2] I Kings 18:1, 21:19.
[3] II Sam. 2:1; Ps. 110:4; I Sam. 10:1, etc.
[4] I Kings 20:28.
[5] Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 46.
[6] Ibid., p. 47.
[7] Ibid., p. 50.
[8] Ibid., pp. 37 f.

and the tradition-complex and the latter may well show that the collectors did not understand the real meaning of the original saying.

The weakest point in Mowinckel's exposition seems to be his attempt to show how literary transmission began.[1] It does not seem to the present writer that Mowinckel does justice to the fact that Jeremiah's oracles were written down in some fullness very early--not only in the prophet's lifetime, but in the midst of his career. That these books have suffered (or profited) from literary extension is obvious. But in view of what we know of Jeremiah (and perhaps also Isaiah 8:1 f.; 30:7 f.; Hosea 2) it is quite possible that we may go too far in positing a long period for the growth of oral tradition and tradition complexes. Other prophets may also have had a Baruch!

But Gunkel on Genesis, Mowinckel on the prophets, and both writers on the Psalter, have opened for us new and fruitful avenues of approach to the Old Testament. The prophetic tradition itself developed amid the earlier traditions of ancient Israel. I have tried in this dissertation to show how the early "scripture" prophets worked within developing tradition-complexes, some written, some oral, or ritually expressed or merely finding their expression in social consent. As they reacted they formed a new tradition--the prophet-tradition itself, with its lasting impact on Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Our growing knowledge of writing and documents in the ancient near east will be a needed control as Old Testament form-history and tradition-criticism,

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 60 f.

still an infant (despite the fact that it preceded the use of the method in New Testament studies) opens for us new insights into the religious life and leadership of ancient Israel.

APPENDIX B

AN EXAMINATION OF DR. H. H. ROWLEY'S ARGUMENTS FOR THE PROPHETIC ACCEPTANCE OF THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM

The main burden of Dr. Rowley's lecture[1] which was delivered in the John Rylands Library on November 14, 1945, is the contention that the prophets did not reject the sacrificial system as such. It is the clearest statement in recent days of the position in direct opposition to that adopted in the present study. Rowley's main thesis is that in the Bible "there is a far greater fundamental unity than is sometimes recognized."[2] The division between the cultic prophet and the priest against the pre-exilic canonical prophets on the question of attitude to sacrifice has been over-stated. This division, Rowley contends, is not absolute, but relative, a question of emphasis. He lists the following recent and contemporary scholars who oppose his own position: Bewer, Leslie, Waterman, Skinner and Volz.[3] There has always been, however, "a minority who have claimed that the prophetic denunciation of sacrifice was relative and not absolute." This "minority" includes Welch, Oesterley, Lattey, H. Wheeler Robinson and Coleran.[4]

---

[1]H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Old Testament (Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1946).

[2]Ibid., p. 4. [3]Ibid., pp. 5, 6. [4]Ibid., p. 5.

As far as I can judge, Rowley gives seven reasons for his position, as follows:

1. "Recent study has emphasized the place of prophetic groups within the cultus." This study includes the work of A. R. Johnson, R.B.Y. Scott and Pederson.[1] A Swedish scholar, Haldar, goes so far as to reduce "all the prophets to members of the priesthood." Rowley does not agree with Haldar.[2]

Rowley rightly contends that we cannot write off all but the canonical prophets as "false prophets." Yet it is difficult not to see a very radical distinction between Amos and Isaiah, for instance, and those prophets "who functioned within the dominant cultus and devoted their efforts to the sustaining and support of the existing order of life."[3]

I. G. Matthews has called the religion of the canonical prophets a layman's religion. It must be admitted, I think, that the scriptural evidence which Rowley cites in support of his claim that they were really cultic prophets, is slight,[4] especially in view of Amos's explicit statement to the effect that he is "neither a prophet, nor a member of a prophetic order."[5]

Even, however, if we concede that Amos and his successors were members of the vocational group known as "prophets," is it

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

[3] Ibid., p. 8 (quoting Graham and May).

[4] Ibid., p. 8: "For Isaiah was officially consulted by Hezekiah . . . and the great canonical prophets not seldom exercised their ministry in the shrines, and we read of a complaint to the priests of Jerusalem that they do not exercise a proper discipline over Jeremiah" (Jer. 29:26 f.).

[5] Amos 7:14.

impossible that protest could arise from within the group itself? If these men did, even as cultic prophets, oppose the sacrificial system, was their protest more radical or impossible than that of Luther for instance, who, after all, was a monk! Many other such instances of protest, and radical protest, from within, could be cited from the entire Hebrew-Christian tradition.

2. Because the canon was the work of men with the priestly viewpoint, the work of the prophets would not have been included had they been absolutely opposed to the sacrificial aspects of the cultus.[1] How do we find the early canonical prophets in the same canon as Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Trito-Isaiah and Ezekiel if their spirit was in diametrical opposition to that of these men on such an important item as sacrifice? How could the two attitudes be bound together in one roll as they are in the Book of the Twelve? Rowley objects to making the distinction one between pre-exilic and post-exilic prophecy:

> For if Hebrew prophecy is first narrowed to mean the canonical prophets, and then narrowed still further to mean a selected few within the group, it would appear that what is convenient to a theory is being selected, instead of Hebrew prophecy being studies without bias. It is, of course, true that the post-exilic prophets were not of the same stature as the greater pre-exilic prophets, and it is also true that a difference of emphasis in their message is apparent. Yet it is still a prophetic emphasis.[2]

It is the contention of the present writer that there is, in fact, a tremendous difference between the attitude of Amos and, say, Malachi. To try to bridge that gulf with a simple common label--"prophet"--simply does not do. After all both Harry Emerson Fosdick and Frank Norris are Protestant ministers! In fact they are both Baptists!

---

[1]Rowley, op. cit., pp. 9 f. [2]Ibid., pp. 9, 10.

Nor is it surprising that the prophets are included in the priest-dominated canon. Surely it is evident that later ages will often adopt the radical once his sting is gone and some of his insights and predictions have proven valid. Here, it seems to me, the words of Jesus to a generation that venerated the prophets whose principles they did not accept, is relevant.

3. The presence of sacrifice in the code of Deuteronomy, the deposit of eighth-century prophecy, argues that the prophets did not completely reject the institution.[1] But, even if we accept the "prophetic inspiration" of Deuteronomy, is it not possible that the compilers of that code did not understand the prophets? It is evident, for example, that either Rowley or, say, Waterman, does not understand them on at least one crucial issue. Moreover, the only prophet who had any direct contact with Deuteronomy was Jeremiah. Even those scholars who believe that Jeremiah at one time supported the deuteronomic reform concede that in the course of his career he turned against it and opposed it.

4. "Nor is it true that the Law was as unconcerned for spiritual religion as is so often supposed."[2] Rowley points out that Jesus, in summing up the important things in the Old Testament revelation, selected two precepts from the Torah. He goes on to remind us that the social ethics of the Holiness Code are very nearly prophetic in spirit.

But the position of those who claim that the prophets rejected sacrifice does not necessitate their claiming that they

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 12 f. [2] Ibid., p. 14.

rejected the Law <u>in toto</u>. We have demonstrated in this dissertation that the social ethics of the prophets stands in the national tradition. It was the prophets' contemporaries who had departed from the tradition at this point, not they.

5. The Psalter, which was the product of the post-exilic age and reflects its attitude (though many of the Psalms may be early, as Rowley points out) is evidence that this age was not unspiritual.[1] It does not seem to me that this observation has much bearing on the question of the prophetic attitude to the institution of sacrifice. To say that the early prophets opposed the institution of sacrifice is not to say that the post-exilic prophets, priests, scribes and legalists, who accepted it, were all "unspiritual." What we are concerned to affirm is merely that the prophets did not support the sacrificial system, as both what they said and what they left unsaid seems to make clear.

In Psalms 51:16,17 we have the prophetic attitude clearly set forth. The verses which follow show how a later scribe tried to make this of none effect. Of can it be contended that all four verses came from the same mind? Is Psalms 51:16,17a a kind of hyperbole? If we used Rowley's method we would have to translate the verses something like this:

> For thou desirest not only sacrifice,
> And should I give nothing but burnt-offering
> thou wouldst not be pleased.
> The sacrifices of God are also a broken spirit; . . .

6. We now come to an examination of the crucial passages.[2]

In his discussion of Hosea 6:6, Rowley rightly insists that be-

---

[1] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 15.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 17 f.

cause of the principle of parallelism, the first line must be interpreted in the light of its parallel. He translates the passage:

> I desire hesed and not sacrifice,
> And the knowledge of God, more than burnt-offerings.

Rowley concedes, however, that the second line can quite as legitimately be translated:

> And the knowledge of God without (lit. "away from")
> burnt-offerings.

He decides for the first rendering on the basis of comparison with "the other prophetic passages about sacrifice."[1]

The other passages have been examined within the text of this study. According to the Rowley interpretation, where the prophet says that Yahweh does not want sacrifice he is using "an idiomatic Hebrew way of expressing comparison to get two things in sharp antithesis in this manner using what Father Lattey has called 'the relative negative.'"[2] Sometimes "not" means "not only." It is interesting to note that the passages cited in support of this "Hebrew" usage are, with one exception, from the New Testament![3] The one Old Testament passage is Joseph's word to his brothers: "It was not you that sent me hither, but God."[4] But is "only" required even in this verse? Joseph is seeking to allay his brothers' fear and guilt. Wouldn't the best way to accomplish this, and the way best in keeping with Joseph's mood at the moment, be to absolve them from all responsibility for his abduction? Is he not really saying: "Do not be afraid, or feel

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.
[2] Ibid., p. 17.
[3] Mark 9:37; John 7:16; Luke 14:26.
[4] Gen. 45:8.

guilty; this was God's work, not yours."? Surely that would be the most effective way of allaying their guilt and fear.

The statements in Amos,[1] Isaiah[2] and Jeremiah[3] which seem to deny the Mosaic origin of sacrifice seem to give Rowley the most difficulty. He comments on Amos 5:25 as follows:

> The commentators suppose that Amos is here denying that any sacrifices were offered in the period of the Wandering, and are somewhat embarrassed to square such a statement with fact. For there is no reason whatever to suppose that Mosaic Yahwism was entirely non-sacrificial, and every reason to accept the tradition, itself older than the time of Amos, that it was sacrificial.[4]

But, conceding that J, for instance, is older than Amos, have we any real evidence that Amos knew the J document as we know it? Surely Hosea and Jeremiah must have known a form of the wilderness tradition which lacked the golden calf story or they could not have so idealized this period. I believe that no literary device will erase the impression which these passages give the ordinary reader that the prophets knew a form of the wilderness tradition which lacked sacrifice.

Realizing the peril of depending too much on the argument from silence, I cannot escape the feeling that the prophets' omission of so much as one hint indicating support of purified sacrifice is significant. When they speak it is only to criticize. If the early prophets wanted a purified ritual they could have said so, as did, for instance, Malachi.[5]

7. Dr. Rowley's final argument is from the standpoint of Christian dogmatics:

---

[1]Amos. 5:25. [2]Isa. 1:12.
[3]Jer. 7:22,23. [4]Rowley, op. cit., p. 18.
[5]Mal. 1:8, etc.

> The view so long current that the Prophets were against all sacrifice is probably in no small measure responsible for the modern dismissal of the interpretation of the Cross in terms of sacrifice. For if sacrifice was already abolished in the teaching of the pre-exilic prophets as in itself an offence to God, the Cross could hardly be interpreted in such terms.[1]

I cannot help but wonder if we do not have here the real reason for the fairly widespread revival of Dr. Rowley's interpretation of the prophets. Against this argument, I put the following considerations:

Whether or not the pre-exilic prophets and Jeremiah criticized the sacrificial system per se is a question to be answered on the basis of the exegesis of the passages in question. Whether or not they were right in so doing, or whether or not the New Testament writers, who accepted the sacrificial metaphor to express their idea of the atonement, were justified in their course--these are two entirely different questions. They are questions of religion and theology which have no bearing, it seems to me, on the prophetic attitude to sacrifice which must be determined by an examination of the words of the prophets. What we are trying to decide here is the prophetic attitude to sacrifice. The proper Christian attitude to sacrifice is quite another question, though the Christian theologian might well take into consideration the prophetic words. These, however, would be by no means his only consideration.

One hesitates to differ with a great scholar like Dr. Rowley. But I cannot escape the feeling that the onus is on the person who claims that a literary device is involved which changes the obvious sense of a passage, to make his case overwhelmingly

---

[1]Rowley, op. cit., p. 30.

convincing. It does not seem to me that the case which Rowley and his supporters present is sufficiently strong to overcome the natural meaning of the words spoken and heard. Surely those who listened to Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah must have thought that they were opposed to the sacrificial system. I think so too!

APPENDIX C

THE SUMMARY ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

A Statement of the Problem

Traditional Christianity and Judaism have regarded the prophets as traditionalists. According to Calvin, the prophets "derived their doctrines" from the Law "like streams from a fountain." The prophets are "appendages to the Law and are all briefly summed up in the Law."[1]

This description of the prophetic role is sometimes accepted in substance by modern scholars who do not accept the older notion that the books of the Bible are simple documents by single writers arranged in approximate chronological order. W.F. Albright comes very close to Calvin's position: "The Tradition of Israel represents the Prophets as preachers and reformers, not as religious innovators; rigid historical and philological exegesis of our sources agrees with tradition."[2]

Despite the fact that such a statement can be supported, at least in part, by quotations from A. B. Davidson,[3] J. Skinner,[4]

---

[1]J. Calvin, Commentary on the Book of Isaiah, trans. Wm. Pringle (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1850), I, xxvi, xxviii.

[2]W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1940), p. 309.

[3]A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904), p. 5.

[4]J. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion (Cambridge: The University Press, 1926), p. 5, cf. p. 332.

C. H. Dodd,[1] W. C. Graham and H. G. May,[2] it is, I think, correct to say that, on the whole, post-Wellhausen Old Testament scholarship has reversed the order Law-Prophets to Prophets-Law and has viewed the prophets as, at least in part, dissenters and innovators, the true pioneers of the Hebrew-Christian tradition.[3] This new appraisal of the genius of the prophetic contribution was stated thus by Wellhausen:

> They do not preach on set texts; they speak out of the spirit which judges all things and itself is judged by no man. Where do they lean on any other authority than the truth of what they say? Where do they rest on any other foundation than their own certainty? It belongs to the notion of prophecy, of true revelation, that Jehovah, overlooking all the media of ordinances and institutions, communicates himself to the individual, the called one, in whom that mysterious and irreducible rapport in which the deity stands with man clothes itself with energy. Apart from the prophet in abstracto there is no revelation. It lives in his divine-human ego. . . .[4]

A modern writer (not an Old Testament specialist) goes so far as to describe the prophets as "anti-religious," demanding a complete break with the past and a thoroughgoing orientation toward the future.[5]

Our problem, then, is: Were the eighth century prophets

---

[1]C. H. Dodd, The Bible Today (Cambridge: The University Press, 1947), p. 39.

[2]W. C. Graham and H. G. May, Culture and Conscience (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 219.

[3]G. H. Gilbert, The Interpretation of the Bible (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908), p. 274.

[4]J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies (Edinburgh: Adam and Chas. Black, 1885), p. 58.

[5]P. Van Paasen, Why Jesus Died (New York: The Dial Press Inc., 1949), p. 66.

and Jeremiah traditionalists or dissenters? Or, better (for investigations like this seldom yield "pat" answers): In what sense can they be called traditionalists and in what sense dissenters? Even if we accept (which we do as a prerequisite in this study) the modern conclusion that the "Law of Moses" as we have it is much later than the early prophets, the prophets undoubtedly stood in the social and religious tradition of ancient Israel. To what extent did they know this tradition and appeal to it? Did they contradict it in any way? Did they modify it, enlarge on it, select parts of it? Did they plead against common contemporary beliefs and practices in the name of primitive tradition? What did they contribute from their own insight and experience? Has their experience with tradition anything to teach religious leaders of our day?

Previous Work in the Area of the Problem

In 1919, J.M.P. Smith wrote an article entitled "The Conservatism of Early Prophecy."[1] This paper deals with the work of Elijah and Elisha and its conclusion is that these two prophets were thoroughgoing conservatives who worked against trends toward civilization, pleading always for primitive nomadic simplicity. Smith left for future consideration the question of whether or not Amos and his successors continued this attitude or whether they represent a new departure in prophetic thinking.

In 1946, Sigmund Mowinckel's Prophecy and Tradition ap-

---

[1]J.M.P. Smith, "The Conservatism of Early Prophecy," The American Journal of Theology, Vol. XXIII, No. 3 (July, 1919).

peared in English.[1] This study, however, deals with the formation and growth of the prophetic tradition itself rather than the relation of this prophetic tradition to the earlier traditions. It is a study in what Mowinckel calls "traditio-historical criticism."

C. A. Simpson, in 1948, gave us his very full and competent description of The Early Traditions of Israel.[2] Here the "pre-deuteronomic narrative of the Hexateuch" is critically analysed and described. Kemper Fullerton in 1919 discussed the ways in which Christian interpreters have dealt with the prophetic tradition.[3]

Perhaps closer to the area of this study is a short article by H.F.D. Sparks entitled The Witness of the Prophets to the Hebrew Tradition.[4] Sparks is not concerned with the prophets' attitude to the tradition--only their knowledge of it. His method is simply to cite texts from the prophetic books which seem to allude to earlier Biblical material. He deals with the prophetic books as we know them, making no distinction between genuine and spurious material.

Edith Hamilton, whose Spokesmen for God (1949)[5] is a re-

---

[1]S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition (Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1946).

[2]C. A. Simpson, The Early Traditions of Israel--A Critical Analysis of the Pre-deuteronomic Narrative of the Hexateuch (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948).

[3]K. Fullerton, Prophecy and Authority (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919).

[4]H.F.D. Sparks, "The Witness of the Prophets to the Hebrew Tradition," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. L (July-October, 1949).

[5]E. Hamilton, Spokesmen for God (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1949).

working of her earlier Prophets of Israel (1936), has decided that the prophets were, on the whole, true religious pioneers. Amos's contribution was to distinguish between the important and the trivial in religion.[1] Hosea was "the first man in the world to declare that love and not fear was the force that could draw men away from evil to good."[2] Isaiah's contribution was his world vision and radical statesmanship.[3] Jeremiah was "the first pacifist."[4] These ideas Miss Hamilton elucidates with clarity and force. She has adopted a certain viewpoint and sets it forth as clearly and forcefully as possible. This work is not in any sense critical. The very texts used are not "cited." The present study would indicate to the writer that her quite thoroughgoing attribution of innovation to the prophets needs considerable modification.

Only J.M.P. Smith, then, deals directly with the kind of problem we have sought to face in this study. But he is concerned with but two prophets--Elijah and Elisha. The concluding words of his paper anticipate the present study:

> This discussion has thus far covered but one stage of a larger subject. I may only suggest its nature now. The policy of hostility to civilization did not win. Was this failure in spite of the best efforts of the prophets from Amos on to champion it and carry it through to triumphant dominance? If so, what influences of a contrary sort came in of such a powerful character as to render the efforts of the prophets futile? Of did Amos and his successors represent a radical change in this respect in that they abandoned the policy of opposition to culture and set themselves deliberately to making Yahweh, the desert God, recognized as the lord of all the ways of civilized man? Are those scholars therefore right who speak of Amos as "the founder of a new phase of prophecy"

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 77 f.

[2] Ibid., p. 111.

[3] Ibid., pp. 123 ff.

[4] Ibid., p. 147.

> or "the pioneer of a process of evolution from which a new epoch of humanity dates," or "the beginner of the new prophecy". . . .[1]

Did a new day indeed begin with Amos or was his work a continuation of the nomadic conservatism of his predecessors?

Methods and Materials Used in This Study

Our approach is largely exegetical. It is an attempt to infer from his words the attitude of the prophet to tradition. In recent studies of Hebrew prophecy two questions have been most commonly asked. Because of our modern interest in psychology, many scholars have asked: "Why did they say it?" and the emphasis, since Hölscher's Die Profeten in 1914 has been on "the prophetic consciousness." Especially has interest been focused on the element of ecstasy as both motive and authority for the prophetic oracles. Others, because of their interest in Near Eastern history and archaeology, have asked: "Could they have said it?" and the answers to this question have been derived, in part at least, from what others were saying at about the same time in cultures geographically proximate to that of the Israelite.

These questions are, of course, very important. But in recent times the tendency has been, perhaps, to stress them at the expense of literary criticism and exegesis. This tendency is something like the besetting sin of the theological student when he reads so many books about the Bible that he lacks time and energy to read the Bible itself. As we approach the oracles of the eighth century prophets and Jeremiah the questions which we will

---

[1]Smith, op. cit., pp. 288, 289.

keep in mind are the following: (1) Did Amos (or whoever we happen to be dealing with) say this? (literary and historical criticism); (2) What, exactly, did he say? (translation and textual criticism where some doubt may be thought to exist); (3) What did he want his hearers to understand by it? (exegesis).

To determine the prophetic attitude to the tradition it is necessary to examine in detail such passages as may be thought to reflect the prophet in the role of either defender or critic of the tradition. We are also interested in traditional practices and traditional persons--"depositaries"--the king, the priest, the cultic prophet.

We are attempting, then, to understand the prophets' attitude to the tradition in which he stood from his words. But we must always keep in mind the sitz im leben of these words. For this reason Near Eastern studies and archaeology have not been neglected. But, on the whole, the emphasis has been exegetical. The prophet has been allowed to "state his case" and his attitude has been inferred from his words. The Bible and the commentaries have been our main tools, but we have tried not to forget the spade and the inscription!

The Argument of the Thesis

The shape of the tradition in the eighth century.--In order to understand the prophetic attitude to the pre-prophetic tradition it is necessary for us to have a mental image of the shape of that tradition. We can perhaps recover this in the Old Testament literature which antedates and is contemporary with the

eighth century,[1] and in what archaeology and Near Eastern history have to reveal about the traditions and contemporary customs of the time.

In the prophetic writings themselves there is evidence, both stated and implicit, that these men were aware of the earlier traditions. It is true that in Amos, Micah and Isaiah historical references are scarce;[2] they are somewhat more abundant in Hosea and Jeremiah.[3] But in all these writings, and in Deuteronomy, the earlier tradition may be said to be assumed. When we add the discoveries and descriptions of archaeology to the early scriptures and the prophetic witness thereto, we can quite safely make the statements which follow descriptive of the shape of the tradition in eighth century Israel.

The prophets of the eighth century were conscious of the historical tradition of their nation. In what exact literary or oral form (or both) this was known to them, it is quite impossible now to determine. We cannot safely say, for instance, that Amos and Micah had the E document before them, Hosea the J document, or Isaiah RJE. But we do know that the patriarch-exodus-

---

[1]A good list of such passages can be found in R. H. Pfeiffer, An Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Bros., 1941), pp. 21, 22.

[2]In the examination of possible historical references we have found the following to be probably authentic, both from the standpoint of their place in the text and the likelihood of their reference to the tradition: Amos 2:10, 3:1,2; 4:4,5, 5:25; Mic. 1:10a, cf. II Sam. 1:20a, chapters 6 and 7 are generally rejected. Isa. 1:9,10, 5:1-6(?), 29:1, cf. II Sam. 5:7.

[3]Hos. 2:15b, 4:6, 6:7, 8:1, 8:12(?), 11:1-4, 12:2,4,12. Jer. 1:6(?), 4:23(?), 7:12, 8:17(?), 10:12(?), 11:4, 15:1, 20:16, 23:14, 23:18(?), 26:6,9, 31:32(?), 31:35(?), 32:20-22, 33:20, 25(?), 34:13, 49:18(?)

wilderness-settlement tradition (henceforth we will designate this tradition by the formula pEWs)[1] was known and from it the children of Israel derived their self-consciousness as a distinct nation. Albright sees behind this tradition a group of patriarch sagas, early cast into a single saga by a "poetic genius"--"and early saga of the Exodus and a saga--or group of sagas--of the conquest of Canaan."

> This group of sagas became standard throughout Israel, and perhaps it was officially sanctioned by the priesthood of Shiloh. After the division of the kingdom--perhaps after the fall of Shiloh . . . the sagas became differentiated into a northern and a southern group, which continued to be transmitted orally. In the course of time variations were introduced, part of which came probably from local sources, as is certainly true of the traditions with regard to places and details of the Israelite conquest. Finally, after this double period of oral transmission, these two groups of sagas were reduced to writing in the late eighth century (J) and the early seventh (E).[2]

---

[1]This formula is thus cited because the tradition is strong in the middle and weak at both ends. See e.g., W. A. Irwin, "The Hebrews," The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946), p. 327: ". . . while the names 'Israel' and 'Jacob' are familiar designations for the nation and descent from Jacob is spoken of, mention of Abraham outside the Pentateuch is astonishingly rare until a quite late time. Since the old narrative documents incorporated in the Pentateuch commonly designated J and E, according to orthodox criticism, were already in existence before the age of the prophets, it is strange that these writers should pass over the impressive account of Abraham's call and the promise to him. References to the nation's history commonly reach back to the oppression in Egypt and the Exodus, in some cases the career of Jacob; but back of that all is blank. The meaning of this situation is difficult to appraise. One solution might be that the J-E stories of Abraham represent a little-known tradition which only through the growing prestige of the proto-Pentateuch won general acceptance about the time of the exile, but familiarity with the story of Jacob was somewhat old." See also Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 161: "It is not the case that the Jews had any profound respect for their ancient history; rather they condemned the whole earlier development, and allowed only the Mosaic time, along with its Davidic reflex, to stand; in other words, not history but the ideal."

[2]W. F. Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1935), p. 147.

Whether or not this is an exact account of events as they actually occurred, certainly something like this must have happened. It would seem that a new formgeschichtliche approach to the Hexateuch in the light of our present archaeological, philological, literary and historical knowledge might yield some fruitful critical results. We can be sure of the following:

> The Israelites believed firmly that they had not always dwelt in Canaan; they had migrated thither out of Egypt; and even there they were not natives, but visitors; their real native country lay elsewhere.[1]

And we have enough evidence to fill in this outline at least to the extent that Kuenen did:

> Now as early as the eighth century B.C. the prophetic exhortations, after they had been delivered orally, were committed to writing; therefore it is possible that the prophets had such writings in their thoughts when they mentioned "the Thorah of Jahweh." Nothing hinders us from assuming that they also had in view collections of laws and admonitions to which a higher antiquity than even a Mosaic origin were attributed.[2]

Beside the pEWs tradition the elements of law and worship must be considered. The early laws of the Old Testament were partly native to the nomadic Hebrews and partly from the ancient civil law of Palestine. They were woven into pEWs at its critical point (just after the exodus in the E document) which seems to show that the compiler of the E sagas and RJE (who left them there) regarded the exodus as the crucial moment in Israel's history. That subsequent generations also so regarded it is evident from the most casual reading of the Old Testament.

---

[1]A. Kuenen, The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State, trans. A. H. May (London: Williams and Northgate, 1882), I, 104.

[2]Ibid., I, 55, 56.

Our knowledge of the worship of the eighth century derives from ritual prescriptions and accounts of worship and sacrifice in pEWs and the prophetic writings, and also from the archaeological description of cult-objects and shrines. There is not much evidence that early Israel's worship differed drastically from that of her neighbors. In fact there is considerable feeling today that the worship which the prophets found is later than the wilderness period and was heavily influenced by the Canaanites. The final work of making detailed worship prescriptions and weaving them into pEWs was left to D and P.

Theology, if we accept the evidence of the documents themselves, was still rather primitive. Yahweh, the tribal warrior god of the early sagas (with more cosmic properties in the song of Deborah), the lusty, near-human companion of Adam and the patriarchs (J) and even David (early Samuel-source), did take upon himself transcendent qualities in E and as the giver of the Horeb covenant became the sanctioner of the group's morality and religion and the determiner of its destiny. Of the guardians of the tradition: the king and his officials (civil law and patriotism) and the priest and the cultic prophet (worship, religion, morality) we shall speak as we meet them in the prophetic oracles to which we now turn.

The eighth century prophet as traditionalist.--In two recent and very able papers A. R. Johnson[1] and Claude Sauerbrei[2]

---

[1]A. R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board, 1944).

[2]C. Sauerbrei, "The Holy Man in Israel," JNES, Vol. VI (October, 1947).

have described the role of the "cultic prophet" and "holy man" in ancient Israel. Both of these papers demonstrate "the unity of the religious movement, and specifically the prophetic movement in Israel."[1] Amos disclaimed any part or lot in the contemporary prophetic movement, it is true,[2] but he is not without sympathy for the prophets whom he describes as Yahweh's "servants."[3] The term "false prophet" is used nowhere in the Old Testament. Just as the charismatic preacher in the store-front Pentecostal church, the pope on his "throne" and the liberal occupant of a suburban Protestant pulpit today are "digged" from the same "pit" and "hewn" from the same "rock" (despite their mutual denunciations of one another) so Moses, Deborah, Samuel, Saul, Nathan, Elijah, Amos, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, despite their differences in emphasis and conception, are heirs of and participate in, a common tradition.

> The form--and the term includes not only the outward manifestations of prophecy, but also the psychic phenomena which characterized it, remained essentially the same for the new prophets as for their predecessors; it was the spiritual content of the ancient form that was the new thing.[4]

In the early days "prophecy was a conservative force in Israel.[5] To what extent did this remain true of eighth century prophecy? Before attempting to answer this we must caution ourselves by reminding ourselves that it is no more possible to stereotype these four prophets than it would be to set forth gen-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 209. [2] Amos 7:14. [3] Amos 3:7.

[4] A. Lods, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, trans. S. H. Hooke (London: Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1937), p. 52.

[5] Ibid., p. 51.

eralizations describing the attitude of, say, four twentieth century Methodist ministers, as if all four presented a common, uniform attitude to their tradition. That the eighth century prophets were informed by essentially the same spirit is almost certainly true, but there is just as surely variety of attitude and interpretation in their viewpoint.

Hosea might be described as the one who could most easily wear the label "conservative." He posits a golden age in the past to which he bids an apostate nation return. He makes the greatest number of explicit references to pEWs, especially the W part of it--but he seems to be fairly familiar with the entire tradition. He comes closer, perhaps, than any of the others to the modern custom of "taking a text." He does not seem to repudiate the institution of prophecy.[1] "Back to nomadism might be his slogan."[2]

Of Micah we have such a scarcity of material, and that of a situational nature, that we can say little of him as a traditionist or otherwise. It seems fairly safe to say that his attitudes are much like those of his contemporary, Isaiah.

Isaiah as a traditionalist must be judged on the basis of his general spirit and underlying assumptions because he does not make explicit references to the great heroes of the past or to pEWs. Of these heroes only David is mentioned, and him very sparingly. Isaiah does not mention, or as far as I can tell even al-

---

[1] Hos. 12:10-13.

[2] W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 239: "Hosea's ideal is a return to the simple, semi-nomadic life of antiquity; eschewing both the comforts and the attendant evils of civilization."

lude to, the exodus and Moses. If there is Isaianic tradition behind chapter nineteen, for instance, it is passing strange that in a discussion of Egypt no mention is made of Moses, the captivity or the exodus. Is it possible that Isaiah has not heard of these events? But Isaiah does share to a small extent, Hosea's idealization of the past. For Isaiah, however, the golden age seems to be the first days of Jerusalem under David. His hope for the future may well have been in terms of a return to those days.[1]

In dealing with Amos we have to take into account the fact that much of our material (Morgenstern argues all of it) comes from one sermon. We do not have the viewpoint of a lifetime as seems to be the case with both Hosea and Isaiah. In two places Amos does seem to appeal to pEWs and the traditional Yahweh-Israel relationship.[2] There is no evidence that Amos rejected the office of prophet, priest or king as such and that he did not object to the holding of holy days is seen from 8:4-6. Amos's social ethics are in the tradition of CC.[3] I can see no evidence that Amos supported the institution of sacrifice.

In view of what might be called the "pan-covenantism" of much contemporary Old Testament theology, it is interesting to note that an appeal to the covenant in the formal, technical sense is not once made by any of these four. We do not have a single instance of the word berith in a genuine oracle in which the cov-

---

[1]Isa. 1:21-31. [2]Amos 2:9 f.; Amos 5:25.

[3]Exod. 22:26, cf. Amos 2:8; Exod. 22:21-24, cf. Amos 2:6b,7, 4:1; Exod. 23:6-8, cf. Amos 5:7, 12b.

enant is a formal undertaking entered into at a given time and place by the whole nation.

As far as we can know the eighth century prophets were not related to a tradition of the creed or book type. The tradition in which they stood had its literature, its ceremonies, its depositaries but these were, it seems, largely accepted by social consent. That there were laws is seen by the existence of the Covenant Code. But whether or not CC was ever proclaimed, or given the force of law, before the "enactment" of the whole Pentateuchal legislation in the days of Ezra, is not clear. It is beyond doubt that the tradition in which Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah stood was largely of the fluid type. The question of a prophet's relationship to a tradition of the "hard" type first rises with Jeremiah and Deuteronomy.

The eighth century prophet as dissenter.--That these prophets were critics of the time-honored institution of their day cannot be denied. For some of these institutions they saw only destruction. For the nation as a whole they also saw destruction. If this constitutes "destructive" criticism, then destructive critics they were.

The idea of history that we find in pEWs is subjected to criticism, drastic revision and, in some cases, rejection. All four of these prophets foresee the coming fall of their nation. That Judah did not fall during the Assyrian period does not detract from their historical insight. Amos, Micah and Hosea are straight prophets of doom. The nation will fall. Isaiah, with his faithful remnant idea and his vision of the restoration re-

tains the persistence-of-the-sacred-community motif which underlies the Warrior-God and Champion of Israel pictures of the early songs and sagas. Isaiah, and particularly Hosea, see a golden age in the past. Isaiah envisions a return to his golden age, but Hosea does not. Hosea's criticism of the present issues from his idealization of the past.

Hosea locates the beginning of the apostasy from the early days of the settlement, very possibly precisely at the time of the institution of the monarchy. Hosea is at least a radical critic of this institution and the case for those of us who believe that he opposed the institution itself is almost, if not quite, conclusive. All four prophets are critics of prophet, priest and king--at least as these worthies are presently functioning.

Sacrifice and ceremonial are made subordinate to justice in Amos, Micah and Isaiah and to religious fidelity in Hosea. Nowhere does any one of these four, by so much as a hint, recommend or urge participation in a purified sacrificial cult. Though admittedly an argument from silence, this is the strongest link in the chain of evidence that supports those students of prophecy who claim that the prophets were anti-ceremonial.

The prophets of the eighth century were not only critics, destructive or otherwise, of "time-honored institutions," they were also critics of certain currently-popular notions, especially eschatological ones. Amos, Micah, and Isaiah see the "day of Yahweh" as a day, not of vindication, but of judgment and punishment, for Israel. Micah certainly,[1] and Isaiah probably, repudiate the

---

[1]Mic. 3:12.

idea of the inviolability of Zion. Isaiah's philosophy of history (if such it can be called) preserves the traditional concept of the perseverance of the chosen community. His faith-remnant idea constitutes the small but firm link between the immediate judgment and destruction and the coming restoration.

Tradition and dissent in the eighth century prophets.-- The eighth century prophets were children of Israel. As such they were the heirs of the religious tradition of Israel. They were its heirs even when they said little or nothing about their heritage. In a very real sense they were the products of this tradition and as far as we know their kind was not produced by any other, nor could it be.

Of the four Hosea can most properly be labelled "traditionalist." For his plea is a call to return to the old ways. In the wilderness period Israel had been faithful to Yahweh. At some point in her history, most probably when she adopted the monarchy--the symbol of civilization--she began to fall away, to become disloyal to her vows, to seek lovers other than Yahweh. Hosea stands as the type of religious leader whose function is to call people back. He is a perennial type and his plea usually finds a response in the hearts of nostalgically minded people, unless his primitivism is too crude, in which case he may be dismissed as a fanatic.

Because of this nostalgia for the old ways, Hosea is the opponent of modern developments of the tradition, the evil of which he sees summed up and most clearly demonstrated in the court. To this writer it seems likely that Hosea was opposed to

the institution of the monarchy as such. Thou Hosea does not seem to have been a Rechabite, there is in his mind a preference for the simple, nomadic ways of his fathers.

Isaiah, on the other hand, was the most "civilized" of the four. And because he identifies himself most thoroughly with the worldly affairs of Judah, his criticism of contemporary politics, international policies, institutions and religious practices is, by that very token, the more courageous. It is a much more simple matter for a hermit to be a radical critic than for a practical politician!

Isaiah does not make Hosea's appeal to the primitive tradition. In fact for Isaiah Israel's history does not seem to begin with Moses at all, but with David. Isaiah's religion has none of the nostalgia that we see in Hosea. His dedicatory experience seems to have come when he was at worship in the temple. And from this direct apprehension of God proceeded his convictions as to what Yahweh required of the nation during that period of ever-recurring crisis. Isaiah never as much as glances back at the exodus for inspiration and ideas. He does not conceive of a solution in terms of a return to anyone or anything--although the result of the coming purge will be the restoration of better early days. In the Syro-Ephraimitish crisis we see him handling the situation from the standpoint of his experience, observation and judgment and boldly predicting the future on the basis of that judgment.

Apart from the fact that he is as much as Hosea the heir of the religious tradition of ancient Israel, Isaiah could not be

called a traditionalist. Nor could he be called a dissenter exactly. He is rather what I choose to call a "situational" prophet with little or no antiquarian interest.

It is quite impossible to generalize about Micah due to the scarcity of authentic material. Micah seems, however, to share the spirit and viewpoint of Isaiah.

In view of the fact that we see Amos on but a few occasions it is not too easy to assess his general attitude to the tradition. We do know that he is compelled, against his own natural inclination, and despite his awareness of the fact that he is not professionally qualified for the task, being a herdsman and orchard-worker rather than a prophet, to protest against the evils in his day in the northern kingdom. He has more interest in the nation's history than has Isaiah, but his chief interest is justice and righteousness here and now. Though Amos does not appeal in the name of the tradition, he is the product of that tradition. The conscience and consciousness of God that he shows, the ability to return good for evil, comes from the fact that he is the heir of Moses.

Little that is novel, in the sense of previously unheard of doctrines, can be found in the ideas of Amos and his immediate successors. For J and his sources, quite as much as for Amos, there is a god, Yahweh, who created the whole world. For both other gods may exist, but it is with Yahweh that Israel must reckon. For the early writers, as well as Amos, Yahweh is quite capable of exercising jurisdiction beyond the borders of Israel, and in the lives of foreigners. He is in control of the physical

universe and can quite as readily harden the heart of Pharoh as he can stir up the qualities of leadership latent in Moses. If Amos instituted a new element in Israel's conception of her God it is in the fact that he replaces, not the idea of the election of Israel, but the idea that election means favoritism, with the conviction that election issues in responsibility.

It is often argued that these eighth century prophets gave impetus to the development of what is called "ethical monotheism." Dr. Albright and his followers put monotheism much earlier than this period. But the "practical monotheism" of early days is in reality monolatry. For the Israel of the early writers Yahweh was the only god to be worshipped and reckoned with. And it also seems apparent that, from very early times in Israel, religion was considered in relation to ethics. It is the emphasis on social justice that is striking in Amos, Micah, and Isaiah. Not that this is in itself new, we find it in the Covenant Code with its base in the code of Hammurabi. But despite the fact that the tendencies in the direction of ethical monotheism that we find in the eighth century prophets are not a novel thing, these teachers do give the doctrine of One God for Israel, a god who requires loyalty and justice, a fresh emphasis in the manner in which they make their witness and protest. Their originality did not consist so much in the novelty of their ideas as in the selection and development of traditional ideas which they featured. This, in turn, was bound to shape and alter the course of the still developing tradition.

Whether or not these prophets rejected the sacrificial

system per se and in toto is a question still debated and still unsettled. That they relegated them to a subordinate place, so subordinate indeed that nowhere does any one of them utter a command or encouragement to sacrifice, is quite apparent. For all practical purposes the eighth century prophets rejected the sacrificial system. They speak of sacrifice only to criticize; never once do they recommend its continuance in a purified form.

To sum up our argument to this point--in the eighth century there existed a national religious tradition in written or oral form, or both, which we have called pEWs. The shape of this tradition can be discerned from the earlier parts of the Old Testament, the cultural remains of ancient Israel and the few references to it that we have on the pages of the prophets themselves. We cannot now determine in exactly what literary or oral form the prophets knew this tradition. It would seem that Hosea at least was familiar with a fairly full version of it, and for him the wilderness experience and possibly the covenant (= marriage) was normative for later Israel. Her present unhappy state issued from her apostasy. Her cure was simply to turn back. Hosea is almost a pure traditionalist and where he appears as a critic and dissenter it is as the critic of modern developments in the expression of the tradition, in the spirit of its primitive purity.

Isaiah, Micah, and Amos are also the products of this tradition. But they do not appeal to it as often and as consciously. In the case of Isaiah we cannot even be sure that he knew the exodus story! These prophets are "situational" preachers and their norm is not so much ancient sanctions, but what is presently, im-

mediately and urgently right or wrong. They demand justice. It is true that justice is a concept we see developing from the very beginning, especially in the earlier law codes. The originality of the eighth century prophets is not to be seen in the direction of thing that they invented the idea of justice or ethical monotheism. It is to be found in their creative personalities and witness and in the way in which they selected, developed and stressed existing concepts and sanctions. The real new ground that they broke in the traditional role of the prophet seems to have been their abandonment of mechanical divination devices, substituting for these observation, reason and inward conviction as the basis of the guidance they sought to give.

The tradition in which these prophets stood was of the fluid type. As far as I can discover there was no legally and ecclesiastically defined orthodoxy by which they could be judged by their adversaries. The orthodoxy that did condemn them, in so far as they were condemned, was an orthodoxy depending on social consent and social indolence for its force. It is true that there probably was some attempt to regulate conduct (but not, I think, belief) by law. But it is with Deuteronomy that the nation first undertakes to put Torah in a book and make that book law and creed, backed by the power of the state-church and the great name of the nation's founder.

Deuteronomy.--Since the publication of DeWette's Dissertatio Critica in 1805, the identification of the code of Deuteronomy with Josiah's temple-book has been one of the cornerstones

of the orthodox critical view of the Hexateuch.[1] This position has in more recent years been attacked from two sides. Kennett in Britain, Holscher in Germany and Berry in America have all argued for a later date. On the other hand Oestreicher in Germany and Welch in Britain have contended for an earlier date. Though both positions are competently argued (Welch's argument is particularly impressive) it seems to the present writer that they both fall short of proof.[2] Add to the inherent strength of the older position, W. A. Irwin's "objective criterion"[3] and it would seem that we can still put Deuteronomy between Isaiah and Jeremiah.

This document, the code of Deuteronomy, is important for the present study because it presents us with our first case of a "hard" as over against a "fluid" type of tradition. II Kings 23:3 is indeed the beginning of the "Bible" idea. Religious and social conformity is no longer to be judged on the basis of ancient sagas and social consent, but by "these words" from which Israel must not turn "either to the right or to the left." It is not enough to catch the spirit of Deuteronomy. Rather it is "all the charge[4] . . . all the statutes and ordinances I am put-

---

[1]See opinions of G. F. Moore, W. C. Graham, and A. Menes cited in J. A. Bewer, L. B. Paton, and G. Dahl, "The Problem of Deuteronomy, A Symposium," The Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVII (1928), 360.

[2]Bewer, Paton, and Dahl, op. cit. The total impact of this valuable discussion certainly leaves this impression.

[3]W. A. Irwin, "An Objective Criterion for the Dating of Deuteronomy," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, Vol. LXI (October, 1939).

[4]Deut. 11:22, 8:1.

ting before you this day"[1] that must be minutely observed. The law of the king underlines the specific and objective nature of this requirement.[2] Thus the book becomes for both king and subject a binding document. It sets forth an orthodoxy of thought, and more particularly behaviour, by which right thinking and right living can be measured. "To the authors it was final, for their purpose infallible, the word of God."[3]

There seem to be three types of influence behind the code--the Covenant Code, the pre-exilic prophets and the peculiar emphases of the deuteronomic party itself.[4] But in final form it breathes the spirit of law, not prophecy. In Deuteronomy the covenant becomes formal, final and fixed. The references to the covenant are 4:23,24; 17:2 f.; and 31:16,20. The good fortune of the Israelites is, by the covenant, conditioned by their utter rejection of the recognition and service of gods other than Yahweh. In chapter twenty-nine we have a picture of a desolated Israel, and one asks: "Why has Yahweh done this to this land?"[5] The answer is: "Because they forsook the covenant and went and served other gods."[6]

Thus the religious leaders who came after 621 B.C. were faced with not only a creed and a law, but with the definite covenant-conception as developed in Deuteronomy.

---

[1]Deut. 11:32. [2]Deut. 17:18-20.

[3]I. G. Matthews, The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel (New York: Harper and Bros., 1947), p. 140.

[4]L. B. Longacre, The Old Testament, Its Form and Purpose (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1945), p. 17.

[5]Deut. 29:24. [6]Deut. 29:25,26.

Jeremiah.--Like Hosea, Jeremiah looks back to the "ancient paths where the good way is."[1] And, also like Hosea, he finds the good way in the wilderness period.[2] That Jeremiah, at least in his youth, accepted the Josianic reform has been argued from such passages as 11:1-8. But J. P. Hyatt has given us a very careful study[3] of this passage which he rejects as a later attempt to make a deuteronomist out of Jeremiah.

There can be no doubt that the deuteronomists have tampered with the passage. It is not necessary, however, to deny the authenticity of the entire oracle. If we excise the obvious deuteronomisms we do have the basis of an oracle entirely in harmony with Jeremiah's spirit and viewpoint elsewhere revealed:

> Thus says Yahweh, the God of Israel:
> "Listen to my voice, and do just as I command you!"
> Then Yahweh said to me:
> "Proclaim all these words in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem, saying, 'I earnestly appealed to your fathers on the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, and have appealed to them, early and late, even to this day, saying "Listen to my voice." Yet they neither listened, nor inclined their ears, but followed each the stubborn promptings of his own evil mind.'"

This leaves Jeremiah appealing, not to a covenant renewal in the land of Moab, but to the day of deliverance, to which he also appeals in 7:22. It seems to the present writer that the modification of this passage on the basis of an assumption of deuteronomic tampering, or the complete rejection of it (as Hyatt urges) does much to make more comprehensible the early chapters of Jeremiah and the personality of the prophet. He, on this view,

---

[1]Jer. 6:16. [2]Jer. 2:2,3a.

[3]J. P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. I (April, 1942).

never appeals to Deuteronomy, but back of it to the supposedly good days subsequent to Sinai.

One of the great problems of the book of Jeremiah is the scarcity of reference to Deuteronomy. There is not so much as one good, clear, uncontested reference. There is no good evidence that he was ever one of the reformers. His oracle on good King Josiah mentions only the latter's sense of justice, not his religious reforms.[1]

In fact the mood of dissent in Jeremiah is seen most clearly in his opposition to what were some of the basic requirements of Deuteronomy. We see this in both reports of the temple address.[2] As Skinner says:

> These two types of mind confront each other in Jeremiah and the better representatives of the Deuteronomic point of view. To the latter it would seem a hopeful thing that the temple court was thronged day by day with reverent worshippers, even if their lives fell short of their profession. To Jeremiah it was simply a profonation of the holiness of God and the most hopeless spectacle that the mind can contemplate.[3]

Both Jeremiah and Deuteronomy opposed the foreign astral cults. But Jeremiah also opposed the domestic cult and like Amos and Isaiah denied its very validity. The words are so unambiguous that it is strange and wonderful that so many interpreters can cavil at their clear import:

> For in the day that I brought your fathers out of the land of Egypt, I did not speak to them, nor give them command regarding burnt-offering or sacrifice.

Skinner once more makes clear (though what could be clearer?) what is said here:

---

[1]Jer. 22:15b,16.

[2]Jer. chs. 7 and 26.

[3]Skinner, op. cit., p. 176.

> The error here rebuked is not simply the practical abuse of sacrificial ritual by men who sought thus to compound for their moral delinquencies; it is the notion that Yahweh had ever instituted sacrifice at all.[1]

Commentators sometimes see a critical reference to Deuteronomy in Jeremiah 8:8. This would accord with his general attitude, but it is not the necessary interpretation here. The total impact of the evidence, nevertheless, is that Jeremiah was in opposition to the reformers. If he ever did support them at all it must have been but for a short time in his youth. Even that cannot be proved.

Like his predecessors, Jeremiah sets himself against prophet, priest and king.[2] In the last days of Judah he becomes, in the eyes of his countrymen a traitor and he works for capitulation to the Chaldaeans. In Jeremiah we see the logical outcome of Amos's famous repudiation of the idea of divine election as divine assurance of safety: "the divine righteousness and holiness are independent of any earthly attachment and must assert themselves in the destruction of that which they once chose and loved."[3]

The "confessions"[4] and the "new covenant passage"[5] (if the latter be authentic) show us Jeremiah as a pioneer in personal religion. Here is perhaps his great unique contribution.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 182.

[2] Jer. 8:11, 7:14-18, 23:30, 23:25-28, 22:11 f., 36:28:3c.

[3] E. L. Allen, Prophet and Nation, A Reconciliation of Divided Loyalties (London: Nisbet and Co., 1947), p. 89.

[4] For a list of the "confession" passages see Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 503.

[5] Jer. 31:27-34.

A traditionalist in his idealization of the wilderness past, this prophet nonetheless was a radical dissenter against the mood and spirit of his times.

Conclusions Reached in the Thesis

The eighth century prophets and Jeremiah can be labelled neither "traditionalists" nor "dissenters" without seriously qualifying either label.

In the following ways they were all traditionalists: They stood in the common national, social and religious tradition of ancient Israel. They accepted the national saga. They all participated in a tradition in which social justice was demanded among men. This tradition runs from the Covenant Code, through the prophets and Deuteronomy into Judaism. They shared a monolatrous theology.

Hosea and Jeremiah were traditionalists in their idealization of the past. Amos and Hosea accepted the role of prophet. Amos, Isaiah, Micah (as far as we know) and Jeremiah accepted the institution of the monarchy.

They also shared the following "dissenting" attitudes: They all found themselves in opposition to the mood and spirit of their times. They denied the validity of the domestic cultus. They relentlessly criticized such depositaries of the tradition as prophet, priest and king. They were all "prophets of doom."

The following dissenting attitudes were peculiar to one or more of them: Amos clearly transformed the meaning of the doctrine of national election. Hosea opposed the institution of the monarchy. Isaiah and Jeremiah were drastic critics of the offi-

cial foreign policy. Jeremiah was at least an unconscious opponent of many of the basic elements of the deuteronomic reform. Jeremiah's foreign policy also made him what would be called today a traitor. In Jeremiah the importance of the individual in religion becomes, perhaps for the first time, clear.

It might be argued that in the prophecy under review two traditions are discernible. Hosea and Jeremiah seem to continue what Smith called "the conservatism of early prophecy." Jeremiah, however, is not the opponent of civilization that Eliham, Elisha, and Hosea were. In Isaiah we see a new note--a thoroughgoing acceptance of civilization and a philosophy of history that sees beyond the impending catastrophe. For from the ruins a remnant will rise to build anew. Faith in the eternal purpose of Yahweh is needed to keep men steady in a time of crisis.

The prophets have much to teach the modern religious leader about his attitude to the tradition in which he stands. He is part of it. He must accept it. But he must also be ready to criticize it and to realize himself and his age a part of its creative unfolding.

The modern Protestant preacher and pastor often likes to compare himself with the Old Testament prophets. We read sometimes of the "prophetic tradition" of the ministry of some "dissenting" denomination as over against the "priestly tradition" of the ministry of a body of a more Catholic type. Yet it is difficult to see a parallel between the modern Protestant religious leader, liberal or conservative, and the prophets included in our survey. Rather it is the cultic prophets and priests, against

whom "our" prophets find themselves in constant opposition, who are the leaders of the Church. It is their responsibility to keep the institution going. It is by a strange twise of fate that the laymen who opposed them were to become for later generations the "canonical" prophets.

It is difficult to see how the prophetic voice in our own day can come from professional religious leaders. Burdened as they are with the care of an institution--and that burden is most essential--they become singularly unfitted by temperament and personal interest to become the critics of their day. At present, or so it seems to the present writer, the voice of prophecy is being sounded by the atomic physicists and their allies--these are the new prophets of doom! It remains to be seen whether or not the rest of us will listen to the new word of God as they speak it or whether we will let future generations, if there be any such, canonize and immortalize those whom the present depositaries will neither hear nor heed. Those who speak against destruction speak in the spirit of the tradition in which we all stand, which early stated that our world and its creatures are divinely made and that their divine builder and architect found them "very good."[1]

It was a prophet who did his work in the era lying just beyond our present survey who emphasized that we must both pay heed to our past and pay attention to the creative work of God that is still going on:

---

[1]Gen. 1:31.

Look to the rock from which you were hewn,
And the quarry from which you were dug;
Look to Abraham your father,
And to Sarah who bore you![1]

The former things, lo! they have come to pass,
And new things I foretell;
Before they spring into being,
I announce them to you.[2]

Remember not former things,
Nor pay heed to things long past.
Behold, I am doing a new thing,
Even now it is springing to light--
Do you not perceive it?[3]

Possible Further Work in the Area of This Problem

This study has sought to carry the investigation of Dr. J.M.P. Smith into the attitude of the pre-canonical prophets to the national tradition into the area of the pre-exilic canonical prophets. It is logical that the next step would be to investigate the "prophets of Judaism," beginning with Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah, along the same lines.

It is, of course, obvious, that some of these prophets--Haggai, Malachi, Zechariah--became indeed preachers of the Law. They were defenders of the Mosaic tradition as it appears in the new fully-grown (or almost fully-grown) Pentateuch. What caused this capitulation to authority, book and creed? Is the pre-exilic dissenting tradition carried on in such books as Ruth and Jonah? What happened in the exile to make it such a great watershed, dividing "genuine" prophecy--with its relentless criticisms of the present forms of the tradition--from the "mere" preachers and reformers of post-exilic times, bound by the now full-fledged Mosaic

---

[1]Isa. 51:1b,2a. [2]Isa. 42:9. [3]Isa. 43:18,19a.

tradition with its priestly bias? Is there indeed such a great hiatus? Here, it seems to me, is the next logical stage in this problem, this particular way of digging and refining in that inexhaustible mine that we call Hebrew prophecy.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Kittel, R. Biblia Hebraica. (2d ed.) 2 vols. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ Bibelanstatt, 1913.

The Bible, An American Translation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Books

Albright, W. F. Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1946.

_____. From the Stone Age to Christianity. Baltimore: The JohnsHopkins Press, 1940.

_____. The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible. New York: The Fleming H. Revell Co., 1935.

_____. The Archaeology of Palestine. London: Penguine Books Ltd., 1949.

Allen, E. L. Prophet and Nation--A Reconciliation of Divided Loyalties. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1947.

Bailey, A. E. Daily Life in Bible Times. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1943.

Brightman, E. S. The Sources of the Hexateuch. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1918.

Burrows, M. What Mean These Stones? New Haven: The American Society for Oriental Research, 1941.

Calkins, R. The Modern Message of the Minor Prophets. New York: Harper Bros., 1947.

Charles, R. H. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity. 2d ed. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913.

Cook, S. A. The Old Testament, A Reinterpretation. Cambridge: W. Heffner and Sons, Ltd., 1936..

Davidson, A. B. Old Testament Prophecy. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904.

Dodd, C. H. The Bible Today. Cambridge: The University Press, 1947.

Driver, S. R. An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. 13th ed. New York: Scribners' Sons, 1908.

Eiselen, F. C. The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament. 2 vols. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923.

Finegan, J. Light from the Ancient Past. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946.

Fullerton, K. Prophecy and Authority. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919.

Gilbert, G. H. Interpretation of the Bible. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908.

Graham, W. C., and May, H. G. Culture and Conscience. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.

Guillaume, A. Prophecy and Divination. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.

Hamilton, E. Spokesmen for God. New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1949.

Hebert, A. G. The Authority of the Old Testament. London: Faber and Faber, 1947.

Hyatt, J. P. Prophetic Religion. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947.

Johnson, A. R. The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel. Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board, 1944.

Kirkpatrick, A. F. The Doctrine of the Prophets. 3d ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1907.

Kittel, R. The Scientific Study of the Old Testament, trans. J. C. Hughes. New York: G. C. Putnams' Sons, 1910.

Kuenen, A. The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State, trans. A. H. May. 4 vols. London: Williams and Northgate, 1882.

Lewis, C. S. Miracles, A Preliminary Study. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947.

Lods, A. The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, trans. S. H. Hooke. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner Co., Ltd., 1937.

Longacre, L. B. The Old Testament, Its Form and Purpose. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1945.

McCown, C. C. The Ladder of Progress in Palestine. New York: Harper Bros., 1943.

McFadyen, J. Introduction to the Old Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.

Matthews, I. G. The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel. New York: Harper Bros., 1947.

Moffatt, J. The Thrill of Tradition. London: S.C.M. Press, 1944.

Morgenstern, J. Amos Studies, Part I, II and III. 2 vols. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1941.

Oesterley, W.O.E., and Robinson, T. H. A History of Israel. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932.

_____. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1934.

_____. Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development. London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1930.

Pfeiffer, R. H. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper Bros., 1941.

Rowley, H. H. The Unity of the Old Testament. Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1946.

Schaeffer, C.F.A. The Cuneiform Texts of Ras-Shamra Ugarit. London: The Oxford University Press, 1939.

Sellin, E. Introduction to the Old Testament, trans. W. Montgomery. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Simpson, C. A. The Early Traditions of Israel, A Critical Analysis of the Pre-deuteronomic Narrative of the Hexateuch. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948.

Skinner, J. Prophecy and Religion. Cambridge: The University Press, 1926.

Smith, G. A. The Early Poetry of Israel in Its Physical and Social Manifestations. London: Oxford University Press, 1912.

Smith, J.M.P. The Prophet and His Problems. New York: Scribners' Sons, 1916.

Smith, J.M.P. The Prophets and Their Times. 2d ed. revised by W. A. Irwin. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Snaith, N. H. The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.

Wellhausen, J. Prolegomena to the History of Israel, with a Reprint of the Article "Israel" from the Encyclopedia Britannica, trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1885.

Willoughby, H. R. (ed.). The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Wolfe, R. E. Meet Amos and Hosea. New York: Harper Bros., 1946.

Commentaries

Binns, L. E. The Book of Jeremiah with Introduction and Notes. London: Methuen and Co., 1919. (Westminster Commentaries).

Calvin, J. Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah. 4 vols. Trans. Wm. Pringle. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1850.

Cheyne, T. K. Hosea, with Notes and Introduction. Cambridge: The University Press, 1889. (Camb. Bible.)

Driver, S. R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. 3d ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902 (I.C.C.).

_____. The Book of Genesis with Introduction and Notes. London: Methuen and Co., 1904. (Westminster Commentaries.)

_____, and Lancaster, H.C.O. The Books of Joel and Amos. Cambridge: The University Press, 1915. (Camb. Bible.)

Harper, W. R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea. New York: Scribners' Sons, 1905 (I.C.C.).

Marti, D. K. Das Buch Jesaja. Tubingen, 1900.

Moore, G. F. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895 (I.C.C.).

Sellin, D. E. Das Zwolfprophetenbuch übersetzt und eklärt, Erste Halfte Hosea-Micha. Leipzig: D. Werner Scholl, 1929.

Skinner, J. The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters 1-39. Cambridge: The University Press, 1900. (Camb. Bible.)

Smith, G. A. Jeremiah, Being the Baird Lecture for 1922. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

_____. The Book of the Twelve Prophets. 2 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908. (Expositor's Bible.)

Welch, A. C. Jeremiah, His Time and Work. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

_____. The Code of Deuteronomy, A New Theory of Its Origin. London: James Clarke and Co., Ltd., 1924.

Articles

Bewer, J. A., Paton, L. B., and Dahl, G. "The Problem of Deuteronomy, A Symposium," The Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. XLVII (1928).

Coles, J. "Prophecy, Prophet and Prophetess," The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XII.

Fullerton, K. "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hope for the Future," The Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. XLI (1922).

Hyatt, J. P. "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. I (April, 1942).

Irwin, W. A. "An Objective Criterion for the Dating of Deuteronomy," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, Vol. LII (October, 1939).

_____. Critical Review on W. F. Albright "From the Stone Age to Christianity," in The Journal of Religion, Vol. XXI (1941).

_____. "The Hebrews" in The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man, ed. J. Frankfort. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946.

Kennett, R. H. "The Origin of the Book of Deuteronomy" in The Church of Israel, ed. S. A. Cook. Cambridge: The Universith Press, 1933.

Rowley, H. H. "The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study," The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XXXVIII (Jan., 1945).

Sauerbrei, C. "The Holy Man in Israel," The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. VI (October, 1947).

Smith, J.M.P. "The Conservatism of Early Prophecy," The American Journal of Theology, Vol. XXIII, No. 3 (July, 1919).

Sparks, H.F.D. "The Witness of the Prophets to Hebrew Tradition," Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. L (July-October, 1949).

Waterman, L. "The Ethical Clarity of the Prophets," The Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXIV (1945).

Wiener, M. "Prophets and Prophecy," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VIII.

Wilder, A. "The Spirit of Our Culture," The Interseminary Series, Vol. I, The Challenge of Our Culture. New York: Harper Bros., 1946.

Williams, N. P. "Tradition," The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings. Vol. XII (1921).

Wright, G. E. "Biblical Archaeology Today," The Biblical Archaeologist, Vol. X, No. 1 (February, 1947).

Lexicon

Gesenius. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Revised by F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. Oxford, 1907.